DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 747 EA 016 692

TITLE	Annual Evaluation Report: Fiscal Year 1983.
INSTITUTION	Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	467p.; Portions of text and tables will not reproduce due to light and/or small print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC19 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Bilingual Education Programs; Categorical Aid; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Assessment; Educational Improvement; Educational Objectives; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Libraries; Minority Groups; Postsecondary Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Programs; Special Education; Tables (Data); Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation and Improvement Act 1981

ABSTRACT

This 13th annual report to Congress provides program-by-program summaries of evaluative information on federally funded education programs for fiscal year 1983. The format for each program description has been revised to make it responsive to the reporting requirements of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA). Accordingly, each entry is divided into three major sections: (1) program profile, covering legislation, recent funding history, purpose, eligibility, and other information on requirements; (2) response to GEPA 417(a), containing major sections of information specified in the mandate, such as program goals, progress and accomplishments, cost effectiveness, plans for improvement and legislative recommendations, supporting studies, and data on participants; (3) response to GEPA 417(b), containing summary information on evaluation contracts. An introductory section is provided which highlights analyses of the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1980. Thereafter, program descriptions are grouped under the following Department of Education jurisdictional headings: (1) Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, (2) Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, (3) Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, (4) Office of Vocational and Adult Education, (5) Office of Postsecondary Education, and (6) Office of Educational Research and Improvement. An index is provided, along with an appendix listing active planning and evaluation contracts during fiscal year 1983. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EA

ED240747

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FISCAL YEAR 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation

EA 016 692

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword vii

Acknowledgment ix

Highlights of Analyses on the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 x

1. Office of Elementary and Secondary Education — Chapter Number*

Education of Disadvantaged Children (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to Local Education Agencies.................... 101
Migrant Education Program (Chapter 1, ECIA) Formula Grants to State Education Agencies........................... 102
Formula Grants to States for Neglected or Delinquent Children... 103
Consolidation of Federal Programs for Elementary and Secondary Education - Chapter 2 State Block Grant............. 104
General Aid to the Virgin Islands.............................. 105
Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services.................... 106
Follow Through-Grants to Local Education Agencies and Other Non-Profit Organizations............................... 107
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Maintenance and Operations 108
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (Impact Aid): Construction................................... 109
Allen J. Ellender Fellowships.................................. 110
Indian Education-Financial Assistance to Local Education Agencies - Part A................................... 111
Special Programs for Indian Students - Part B.................. 112
Special Programs for Indian Adults - Part C 113
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program....................... 114
Women's Educational Equity - Discretionary Grants for Model Development, Dissemination, and Demonstration....... 115
Migrant Education-High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)............... 116
Arts in Education Program...................................... 117
Inexpensive Book Distribution Program.......................... 118
Secretary's Discretionary Fund Program......................... 119

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

2. Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs Chapter Number*

Bilingual Education--Discretionary Grants........................ 201
Bilingual Vocational Education Programs--Discretionary Grants... 202
Transition Program for Refugee Children.......................... 203
Bilingual Education--Training Programs........................... 204
Bilingual Education--Support Services............................ 205

3. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Aid to States for Education of Handicapped in State Operated and State Supported Schools.................... 301
Handicapped School Programs...................................... 302
State Incentive Grants for Preschool Services to Handicapped Children.. 303
Handicapped Regional Resource Centers............................ 304
Handicapped Innovative Programs-Deaf Blind Centers............... 305
Early Childhood Education Program for Handicapped Children.. 306
Innovative Programs for Severely Handicapped Children............ 307
Regional Education Programs for Deaf and Other Handicapped Persons... 308
Training Personnel for the Education of the Handicapped.......... 309
Handicapped Teacher Recruitment and Information.................. 310
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped-Research and Demonstration Activities.. 311
Discretionary Grants for Handicapped-Media Services and Captioned Films... 312
Education of the Handicapped Act - Special Studies............... 313
National Institute of Handicapped Research....................... 314
Rehabilitation Services - Basic Support.......................... 315
Client Assistance Program (CAP).................................. 316
Discretionary Project Grants for Training Rehabilitation Personnel... 317
Grants for Vocational Rehabilitation of Severely Handicapped Individuals.. 318
Special Projects for Initiating Recreation Programs for Handicapped Individuals...................................... 319
Rehabilitation Services - Special Projects for Handicapped Migratory and Seasonal Farmworkers................ 320
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults... 321
Rehabilitation Services - Projects with Industry................. 322
Centers for Independent Living................................... 323

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

4. Office of Vocational and Adult Education

Chapter Number*

Vocational Education-Basic Grants to States.................... 401
Vocational Education-Special Programs for the Disadvantaged.. 402
Vocational Education-Formula Grants to States for Consumer and Homemaking Education........................ 403
Vocational Education - Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations... 404
Vocational Education - Programs of National Significance....... 405
Adult Education -- State-Administered Program.................. 406

5. Office of Postsecondary Education

Pell (Basic Educational Opportunity) Grant Program............. 501
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program............. 502
State Student Incentive Grants................................. 503
Guaranteed Student Loan Program................................ 504
Direct Loan Program.. 505
Work Study Program... 506
Upward Bound... 507
Talent Search.. 508
Educational Opportunity Centers................................ 509
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students.................... 510
Veterans' Cost of Instruction Program.......................... 511
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education 512
Training Program for Special Programs Staff and Leadership Personnel............................. 513
Institutional Aid Programs..................................... 514
Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program.............. 515
Law School Clinical Experience Program......................... 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged........................... 517
Fellowships for Graduate and Professional Study................ 518
Fulbright-Hays Training Grants Program 519
Language Training and Area Studies............................. 520
Cooperative Education 521
Land-Grant Colleges and Universities........................... 522
College Housing Program.. 523
Annual Interest Grants... 524
Loans for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation of Academic Facilities................................... 525

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

6. Office of Educational Research and Improvement — Chapter Number*

Territorial Teacher Training Assistance Program................. 601
Public Library Services - Grants to State Library Agencies.. 602
Interlibrary Cooperation - Grants to State Library Agencies.. 603
College Library Resources - Discretionary Grants and Contracts... 604
Library Career Training - Discretionary Grants................. 605
Library Research and Demonstrations - Discretionary Grants and Contracts....................................... 606
Strengthening Research Library Resources - Discretionary Grants to Major Research Libraries....................... 607

Index to the Annual Evaluation Report

Appendix - Evaluation Contracts Active in OPBE During Fiscal Year 1983

---

* Chapter numbers, followed by page numbers within chapters, appear in the upper-right corner of each page.

Foreword

This is the 13th annual report to Congress on federally funded education programs and the fourth such report submitted by the Department of Education. The Annual Evaluation Report responds to Congressional mandates in Section 417(a) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), in Section 1246 of the Education Amendments of 1978, and in Section 1305 of the Education Amendments of 1980.

The Planning and Evaluation Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, has revised the report's format this year to make it more reponsive to the requirements of those mandates. The new format is keyed to the specific reporting requirements listed in GEPA. Particular effort has gone also to reducing the size of the report by focusing on current information about program operations and evaluation, and to improving the editorial quality of the report. These changes should make the report more useful to its intended audience in the Congress and in the Department of Education.

The three major sections of the new format are as follows:

I. Program Profile, which includes legislation, recent funding history, program purpose, eligibility, required assurances, distribution formula, and other pertinent information on requirements for participation;

II. Response to GEPA 417(a), which contains the major sections of information specified in the mandate. Part A identifies program goals and objectives which pertained in fiscal year 1983 to the implementation of legislative purposes. Part B, on progress and accomplishments, shows how the program was implementing goals and objectives in terms of delivery of funds and services. Part C, on costs, benefits and effectiveness, summarizes what we know from recent evaluations and analyses about how well program funds and services were reaching intended beneficiaries and about the effect of those funds and services. Part D, on plans for program improvement and recommendations for legislation, describes the plans of program offices to improve program operations, and the legislative intitiatives of the Administration regarding that program. Part E, on supporting studies and analyses, lists studies of current relevance which support the findings reported in Part C. Finally, Part F provides available data on program participants and program effectiveness by sex, age, and race of beneficiaries;

III. Response to GEPA 417(b), which contains summary information on evaluation contracts in effect during the fiscal year of the report.

The GEPA mandate refers to "applicable programs" as the subject of the report. Program consolidation, reorganization, and termination of authorization or appropriations, have made more difficult than ever this year the definition of an "applicable program" for purposes of reporting. Nonetheless, we began once again with the all-purpose table of programs prepared by the Budget Service, as our basic source. As the report developed during fiscal year 1983, we eliminated a few chapters for programs which had neither received appropriations for that year nor had grantee projects operating in the field. We also added a chapter on programs which the Congress had consolidated in 1981 under the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, but which kept alive their identity and activities through the Secretary's Discretionary Fund established under that legislation.

I would appreciate further suggestions on making the report still more useful to you in your work. Please direct your comments to Edward Glassman, Policy Analysis Coordinator in Planning and Evaluation Service, at (202) 472-9235 or at the address below.

Gary L. Bauer

Gary L. Bauer
Deputy Under Secretary for
Planning, Budget and Evaluation

For copies while our limited
supply lasts, contact:

Mr. Edward B. Glassman
Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation
Planning and Evaluation Service
Room 3127, FOB-6
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 472-9235

Acknowledgment

As noted in the Foreword, the Planning and Evaluation Service has tried to improve the editorial quality of the report this year through revisions in its format and through greater consistency of format and style. A small team of editors has reviewed and revised draft materials for that purpose. A special word of thanks is in order to Robert Barnes, who acted as lead editor and provided guidance and review during preparation of draft program chapters. He was assisted by Carol Chelemer in the Planning and Evaluation Service, and by Linda Rule, Henry Bretzfield and Llewellyn Robbins in the Office of Legislation and Public Affairs.

In the Planning and Evaluation Service, Edward Glassman was again responsible for coordination of report preparation, with support from Robert Maroney, Leona Edwards, Yvonne Briscoe and Charlene Medley. Janice Anderson developed the report Index which is a new feature this year. All analysts and all divisions in the Service contributed to the report through writing and typing the program chapters. Program offices in the Department helped with detailed comments on draft chapters about their own programs. Finally, as in past years, Budget Service in the Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, and the Office of General Counsel, provided extensive and invaluable corrections and comments on draft materials for the entire report.

John D Klenk

John D. Klenk
Director, Planning and
Evaluation Service

HIGHLIGHTS OF ANALYSES ON THE EDUCATION CONSOLIDATION AND IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1981

Highlights of Analyses on the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981

Immediately after the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) became law, the Department of Education staff prepared a number of studies and analyses related to the provisions of that Act. Those studies, beginning in fiscal year 1982, focused on the issues that had been debated during enactment of the law, and on the planning for and implementation of the programs under Chapters 1 and 2 of the ECIA. During fiscal year 1983, the findings of several studies and analyses of those programs became available, as did information on the first full year of operation of programs under the Secretary's Discretionary Fund established by Chapter 2 of the ECIA.

Issues about Chapter 1 (and Title I) include the numbers of students being served, how they and their schools are selected, the nature of services received by public and private school students, and the effectiveness of those services. The first year of the block grant called attention to issues about funds distribution and use. Similar issues pertain to the first year of the operations of the Secretary's Discretionary Fund.

Highlights of findings about these issues are included below while the separate program chapters in the Annual Evaluation Report discuss each in more detail.

I. Findings of Analyses on Chapter 1 (see Report Chapter 101)

o About students and services

- Data from the States describing their FY 1982 Part A programs showed (a) slight declines in students served, (b) emphasis on students in grades 1 through 6 (69% of the students served), and (c) emphasis on reading (70% of all participants got reading instruction);

- Districts reported using varying eligibility definitions and student selection procedures, with 44 percent of districts serving all eligible public school students;

- 45 percent of the Nation's school districts had private school students residing in Title I (Chapter 1) attendance areas; 56 percent of them served the private school students in Title I;

- Local educators used varying instructional approaches but mostly pulled students from their regular classes for Title I activities, but use of in-class approaches was increasing;

- Local educators perceived the same flexibility in Chapter 1 for selecting schools as previously in Title I (although many of those who noted more flexibility also complained about it).

o About effectiveness

- Three-year data from school years 1979-80 through 1981-82 showed modest reading and mathematics achievement gains in nearly all grades 2 through 12 each year.

II. Findings from Analyses on Chapter 2 (see Report Chapter 104)

o About the distribution of funds

- Data from State applications showed States reserving 19% for State use, of which 13% (2% of the total) was used for administration, 7% for basic skills, 74% for education improvement and support, and 6% for special projects;

- States allocated funds to districts by formula and through State-run competitions resulting in funding increases to two-thirds of the Nation's districts;

- Of the Nation's largest 28 districts and cities, 12 received more funds under the block grant than under the previous programs, and 16 received less. The funding losses ranged from .03 of one percent to 1.8% of operating budgets.

o About districts' uses of the funds

- Thirty-three States reported to the Department about their districts' uses of the block grant funds. Their data showed 85% of the funds being used for education improvement and support, 6% for basic skills, and 9% for special projects.

- The American Association of School Administrators reported that 15 percent or more of the 1125 districts responding to its survey were using their block grant funds for teacher salaries, staff training, audiovisual equipment, computer hardware and software, and books or materials.

III. Findings about the Secretary's Discretionary Fund (see Report Chapter 119)

o The Secretary's Discretionary Program assisted programs of four types:

1. Those mandated by the ECIA (Arts in Education, Inexpensive Book Distribution, and Alcohol and Drug Abuse) which accounted for 37% of the total funds;

2. One required by the report accompanying the Fiscal Year 1983 Appropriations Act (Law-related Education) for 3% of the funds;

3. Three contained in House or Senate Appropriations Committee reports in response to the Department's budget request (National Diffusion Network, Educational Television and Technology, and Evaluation of the Block Grant) for 48% of the funds; and

4. Discretionary activities, supported by the remaining 12% of the funds.

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDUCATION OF DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
FORMULA GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.010)

Highlights:

- o Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA) was implemented nationwide for the first time in school year 1982-83, replacing the antecedent Title I, ESEA. Final regulations and nonregulatory guidance were published (Section II.B below).
- o Study of State Management Practices under Title I was completed (II.C).
- o Description of District Practices study was completed (II.C).
- o On November 18, 1983, Congress passed the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 Technical Amendments, to improve the implementation of ECIA.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (Expires September 30, 1987).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year:	Total Authorization:	Total Appropriation:	Appropriations for LEA Grants: 1/
1979	$ 5,680,447,238	$ 3,228,382,000	$ 2,776,577,501
1980	6,291,969,913	3,215,343,000	2,633,000,000
1981	7,047,423,325	3,104,317,000	2,611,386,972
1982	3,480,000,000	3,160,394,000	2,562,753,163
1983	3,480,000,000	3,200,394,000	2,727,587,568

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children.

Eligible Recipients: Chapter 1 provides formula grants to LEAs. Chapter 1 also makes payments to State educational agencies (SEAs) for administration and for State-operated programs, to the outlying territories, and to the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of Indian children.

Eligible Beneficiaries: Chapter 1 provides services to educationally deprived children residing in school attendance areas with high concentrations or numbers of children from low-income families. Comparable services must be provided to educationally deprived children who live in eligible attendance areas but who attend private schools.

Chapter 1 Formula: The Department calculates county allocations based on a formula which takes into account, among other things, the numbers of 5-17 year old children in low-income families and the average State per-pupil expenditure. SEAs provide sub-county allocations to LEAs.

Applicant Requirements: LEAs submit applications to SEAs for approval at least every three years. Specific items of information must be updated annually. Applications must describe the programs and projects to be conducted, and must contain the following assurances:

- Projects are conducted in attendance areas having the highest concentrations of low-income children or having uniformly high concentrations of such children. Projects may also be designed to utilize part of the available funds for services which promise to provide significant help for all educationally deprived, low-income children.
- Annual assessments of education needs are conducted in order to determine which children will receive compensatory education and what needs will be addressed.
- Projects will be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting the special educational needs of the children being served, and are designed and implemented in consultation with parents and teachers of such children.
- Projects will be evaluated in terms of their effectiveness.
- Provision for services to educationally deprived children attending private elementary and secondary schools will be made.
- Records and information necessary for fiscal audit and program evaluation will be maintained.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Publish program regulations.
- Provide nonregulatory guidance which increases State and local flexibility in the design, implementation, and administration of programs.
- Establish a program to assist State and local educational agencies in improving the quality and cost-effectiveness of their Chapter 1 projects.
- Develop procedures for collecting participation and evaluation information from SEAs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Final regulations for Chapter 1, ECIA were published on November 19, 1982. The regulations reflect the intent of Congress, in enacting Chapter 1, to "eliminate burdensome, unnecessary, and unproductive paperwork and free the schools of unnecessary Federal supervision, direction, and control."

B. Progress and Accomplishments: (continued)

- o In July 1983, "Nonregulatory Guidance to Assist State Educational Agencies in Administering Federal Financial Assistance to Local Educational Agencies for Projects Designed to Meet the Special Educational Needs of Educationally Deprived Children Under Chapter 1 ..." was disseminated. The interpretations and policies contained in this document are binding only on officials of the U.S. Department of Education. SEAs are encouraged to develop alternative approaches to providing compensatory educational services that may be more in keeping with local needs and circumstances, so long as they are not inconsistent with the Chapter 1 statute and regulations.

- o Under the "Secretary's Initiative to Improve the Quality of ECIA, Chapter 1 Projects," a new program of competitive grants was begun to provide assistance to SEAs in expanding or developing activities to identify, validate, disseminate, or implement program improvement strategies. In FY 1983, the Department made 21 grant awards, totalling $1.048 million.

- o In August 1983, the Department published a form for use by States in reporting Chapter 1 student and staff counts and student achievement information.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: The most recent data about this program are from school year 1981-82. In that year, approximately $2.5 billion were distributed to about 14,000 eligible school districts. States reported serving approximately 4,670,000 public school students and 184,000 private school students during the regular school term, and 187,000 students during the summer. Grade levels served ranged from prekindergarten (less than one percent of those served) through 12th grade (about one percent of the children served); 69 percent of the children receiving Title I services were in grades one through six.

Declines of roughly 12 percent were indicated in the numbers of public school students served in Title I between 1978 and 1981. A similar decline was noted in the number of private school students served. The nature and intensity of services provided to private school participants were generally comparable to those received by public school students (E.1).

As reported by 40 States, 54 percent of Title I participants in 1981-82 were white, 32 percent were black, 11 percent were Hispanic, one percent were American Indian/Alaskan Native and one and a half percent were Asian/Pacific Islanders (E.1).

Types of Benefits Provided: In school year 1981-82, 70 percent of all program participants received compensatory instruction in reading, and 42 percent received supplementary mathematics instruction (E.1). Other major instructional service areas included language arts (20 percent of the students), limited English and English as a second language (11 percent), and other instructional, e.g., social studies (22 percent). In addition, support services such as attendance and guidance counseling (21 percent) and health/nutrition (18 percent) were also provided (E.1).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

The average Title I student received four hours of special program instruction a week, in small classes averaging 9.8 students (E.2).

Local project funds supported approximately 177,000 full-time equivalent staff positions during the 1981-82 school term (of which 85 percent were teachers or teacher aides) and an additional 18,000 positions during the summer term. Inservice training was provided for almost 275,000 personnel, of which 84 percent were teachers or teacher aides.

Program Administration: Two major studies have recently been completed which describe local and State administration of Title I.

The Description of District Practices study (E.2) found:

- Districts used widely varying definitions and procedures for selecting students to receive program services -- 44 percent of the districts sampled reported serving all eligible students, with small districts more likely to serve all eligible students than large districts.

- The predominant instructional setting was a pull-out program, but the use of in-class instruction was increasing -- 30 percent of the districts used an in-class approach for at least some of their services.

- Title I Directors reported that 81 percent of the districts' Parent Advisory Councils (PACs) advised local administrators on program planning, implementation, or evaluation. However, for each of these areas, a substantial number of PACs (at least 19 percent) gave no input. Requirements related to PACs were viewed by Title I Directors as among the most burdensome and least necessary.

- Few districts reported any difficulty in meeting Title I's maintenance of effort, comparability, or excess cost provisions. A large proportion of Title I Directors were generally favorable to Chapter 1's revised funds allocation requirements.

- Over half the district administrators believed that Chapter 1 afforded the same flexibility in selecting schools as did Title I; however, a similar percentage were concerned that relaxed school selection requirements would make it more difficult to target services effectively.

- Phase III of the Description of District Practices study was completed on September 30, 1983. Detailed descriptions of solutions to problems faced by local school officials operating Chapter 1, ECIA programs were developed. These materials focus on: describing useful strategies for serving nonpublic and secondary school students, designing in-class projects, and using teacher judgment scales in combination with objective data sources for making student selection determinations.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

The Study of State Management Practices (E.3) found:

- A majority of States (39) monitor their programs for quality as well as for compliance. Program quality monitoring included such activities as classroom observation, teacher interviews, and reviews of evaluation findings. The "quality-oriented" States intended to continue about the same level of monitoring under Chapter 1, even in light of fewer Federal requirements; however, monitoring activities would be affected by any funding level changes.

- Twenty-two States made rules, generally designed to help districts implement quality programs. Districts had difficulty differentiating State rules from Federal rules.

- Nineteen States reported a reduction in paperwork as a result of going to a three-year application cycle. Under Chapter 1, State coordinators thought they could streamline the application approval process, for instance, by developing consolidated program applications.

- A majority of State coordinators said that evaluation data were important to improve programs, and they encouraged their districts to use evaluation results. Approximately 30 Coordinators planned to continue using the Title I Evaluation and Reporting System (TIERS), though possibly in a modified form, to collect Chapter 1 information.

Program Effectiveness: Based on the results of student achievement testing States reported the following results in reading:

Table 1

1981-82 Title I Reading Achievement Results
for Students Tested on a Full-Year Schedule
(Based on data from 47 States)

Grade	Weighted Number Tested	Normal Curve Equivalent			Percentile	
		Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest
2	91,464	37.7	39.0	1.4	28	30
3	107,891	34.2	36.4	2.2	23	26
4	108,376	34.7	37.4	2.7	23	28
5	113,194	34.9	38.2	3.4	24	29
6	95,646	35.4	38.7	3.3	24	30
7	64,161	34.9	37.4	2.5	24	28
8	57,938	34.5	37.7	3.2	23	28
9	31,644	33.4	35.8	2.4	22	25
10	12,473	31.2	32.0	.9	19	20
11	10,567	30.6	31.2	.6	18	19
12	7,385	29.0	30.6	1.6	16	18

Source: 1981-82 State Performance Reports

Table 2

1981-82 Title I Reading Results
for Students Tested on a Fall-Spring Schedule
(Based on data from 47 States)

	Weighted Number	Normal Curve Equivalent			Percentile	
Grade	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest
2	252,404	31.3	39.8	8.5	19	32
3	238,607	31.6	38.4	6.8	19	29
4	229,700	31.5	37.8	6.3	19	28
5	215,766	31.5	37.8	6.3	19	28
6	180,989	31.8	37.6	5.7	19	28
7	132,655	31.4	36.1	4.8	19	26
8	101,807	31.2	35.8	4.6	19	25
9	55,431	31.3	35.9	4.6	19	25
10	28,851	30.7	34.7	4.0	18	23
11	15,250	28.5	32.2	3.7	15	20
12	8,148	26.3	31.1	4.8	13	19

Source: 1981-82 State Performance Reports

States reported the following results based on student mathematics achievement testing:

Table 3

1981-82 Title I Mathematics Results
for Students Tested on a Full-Year Schedule
(Based on data from 47 States)

	Weighted Number	Normal Curve Equivalent			Percentile	
Grade	Tested	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest
2	51,093	39.6	42.7	3.0	31	36
3	65,626	37.3	40.6	3.3	27	33
4	64,180	38.2	40.8	2.6	29	33
5	68,596	38.0	41.8	3.8	28	35
6	63,949	37.5	41.8	4.3	28	35
7	41,735	36.1	39.1	3.0	26	30
8	36,696	36.6	39.8	3.2	26	31
9	21,385	36.4	37.6	1.2	26	28
10	7,806	34.6	34.8	.2	23	24
11	6,764	35.8	36.4	.6	25	26
12	4,507	33.3	33.9	.6	21	22

Source: 1981-82 State Performance Reports

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness: (continued)

Table 4

1981-82 Title I Mathematics Achievement Results
for Students Tested on a Fall-Spring Schedule
(Based on data from 47 States)

Grade	Weighted Number Tested	Normal Curve Equivalent			Percentile	
		Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest
2	91,569	32.7	44.5	11.9	20	40
3	106,286	32.4	41.4	9.0	20	34
4	115,586	31.7	41.6	9.9	19	35
5	116,045	32.9	41.3	8.3	21	34
6	98,710	32.9	40.9	8.0	21	33
7	70,787	33.7	39.5	5.8	22	31
8	54,156	33.8	39.5	5.7	22	31
9	26,247	32.7	40.0	7.2	19	31
10	11,136	33.8	39.8	6.0	22	31
11	5,941	31.3	37.0	5.8	19	27
12	3,155	32.1	37.2	5.2	20	27

Source: 1981-82 State Performance Reports

For school year 1981-82:

- In reading, the "average" Title I elementary student was at about the 24th percentile when selected to participate in the program based on a full-year test cycle (usually spring-spring testing).
- In reading, the "average" Title I student performed at the 19th percentile when selected for participation based on a fall-spring cycle.
- In mathematics, the "average" Title I elementary student was at the 28th percentile when selected on a full-year cycle.
- In mathematics, the "average" Title I student performed at the 20th percentile when selected on a fall-spring cycle.
- Students selected on a fall-spring cycle appeared at pretesting to score consistently below those selected on an annual cycle. However, by spring posttesting, the scores of both groups were comparable.

For school years 1979-80 through 1981-82:

- In each of the three years, modest reading achievement gains were found in nearly all grades.
- Modest mathematics achievement gains were also found in nearly all grades.
- High school students selected for Title I tend to be needier compared to their peers than students selected at the elementary grades.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness: (continued)

- Mullin and Summers (E.4), in a review of 47 studies of compensatory education through the 1970's, published findings similar to those reported by SEAs and by other ED studies, such as the "Sustaining Effects Study." Overall, they claimed that: "programs have a positive, though small, effect on the achievement of disadvantaged students"; most results are overstated due to methodological errors; gains appear to be greater in earlier years (though they are generally not sustained); and, gains are not consistently associated with either dollars spent or with the application of any single educational approach.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

The Administration has proposed legislation to permit LEAs and States to implement Chapter 1 as a voucher program. Parents of educationally disadvantaged children selected for participation would receive a voucher to provide for participation of the child in compensatory education programs in the school district, in private schools, or in public schools outside the district.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C:

1. State Performance Reports, 1979-80 through 1981-82.

1a. ESEA Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies -- A Summary of State Reports for 1979-80, 1980-81 and 1981-82, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation, Washington D.C., October, 1983.

2. Local Operation of Title I, ESEA 1976 - 1982: A Resource Book, Advanced Technology, Washington D.C., June 1983. (Summary report of Phases I and II of the "Description of District Practices" study).

2a. Summary Report on Phase III of the District Practices Study, Advanced Technology, Washington D.C., September, 1983.

3. A Study of State Management Practices: Looking Back at Title I and Toward Chapter 1, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, August 1982.

4. Mullin, Stephen P., and Summers, Anita A. "Is More Better? The Effectiveness of Spending on Compensatory Education." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1983, pp. 339-347.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The following studies are under way or are scheduled to begin in FY 1984:

- Technical Amendments to the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, which were enacted on November 18, 1983, mandated a new "National Assessment of Compensatory Education." The National Institute of Education will manage this activity, which will both examine educational effects of compensatory education programs on participating children as well as develop a national profile of Chapter 1 programs. Interim reports are due to the Congress in January and July of 1986, with a final report due in January, 1987

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-3081

Program studies: Robert Stonehill, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1/ Excludes Special Incentive Grants and State-operated programs (which include the Migrant Education Program, the Program for Neglected or Delinquent, and the Chapter 1 Handicapped Program).

MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (CHAPTER 1, ECIA)
FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES TO MEET THE SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF MIGRATORY CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.011)

Highlights:

- New legislation proposed to reduce the time period for children to be counted as "formerly migratory" (section II.D. below).
- New regulations proposed to better focus the Chapter 1 Migrant Education Program (section II.D. below)
- New legislation passed as part of the technical amendments to ECIA maintaining the existing definition of "currently migratory child" (section II.D. below)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 97-35, Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, enacted as part of of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. (Expires September 30, 1987).

Funding since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$209,593,746	$209,593,741
1980	245,000,000	245,000,000 1/
1981	266,400,000	266,400,000
1982	255,744,000	255,744,000
1983	255,744,000	255,744,000

Purpose: To establish and improve programs to meet the special educational needs of migratory children of migratory agricultural workers or migratory fishers.

Eligibility: A State educational agency (SEA) may apply for a grant to operate a State migrant education program directly, through subgrants to local educational agencies (LEAs), or through arrangements with public or nonprofit private agencies. Two or more SEAs may apply jointly for a grant to support a migrant education program that benefits eligible migratory children in those States.

Applicant Requirements: An applicant SEA must submit a State Plan and cost estimate which meet the requirements of and contain the information outlined in current regulations.

Formula: The Department of Education calculates State allocations based on the number of full-time equivalent migratory children aged 5-17 years residing in a State over a 12-month period and the State's average per-pupil expenditure 2/. Prior to FY 1975, the number of migratory children was based upon estimates of numbers of migrant children supplied by the U.S. Department of Labor. Beginning in FY 1975, however, State allocations have been based on migrant student counts contained in the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS), a computer system housed in Little Rock, Arkansas under contract to the Department 3/.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are reviewed and awarded annually. Projects typically operate for one fiscal year; however, unspent funds may be carried over into the next fiscal year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Grantees are required to maintain appropriate accounting, personnel, performance and other program records for program audit and evaluation.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- To modify, through regulations, the definition of "currently migratory child" so as to require, as a condition for eligibility under this category, that a child's education be interrupted as a result of a geographical move and that work in seasonal agriculture or fishing be the parent's primary occupation.
- To focus the program more effectively on children who are truly migratory by amending the authorizing statute to reduce the time that a formerly migrant child can receive services from five years to two years.
- To award grants for projects designed to operate in school year 1983-84.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A Notice of Proposed Rulemaking was published on December 3, 1982 proposing new regulations (including the definition change noted in II. A. above) for the Chapter 1 migrant program.
- An amendment to the authorizing legislation was proposed to the Congress on February 4, 1983 to reduce the period of eligibility for services for "former migratory" children.
- The Department awarded 51 new Basic grants ranging from $27,659 to $73,541,560 across States and 13 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination grants to seven different States at an average cost of $158,976 per project.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The following table indicates the number of full-time equivalent students registered on the MSRTS since 1977. These counts serve as the basis for program funding. One full-time equivalent equals 365 days of enrollment on the MSRTS. A count of the actual number of students identified as eligible for services and enrolled on the MSRTS is also listed below. Many students are not enrolled for the full calendar year, which accounts for the difference between FTE and actual counts.

Calendar Year	Full-time Equivalent Students (ages 5-17)	Number of Eligible Students
1977	296,430	467,796
1978	323,501	494,417
1979	366,460	522,154
1980	398,798	550,253
1981	417,298	577,483
1982	426,014	593,042

The Migrant Education Program has grown from 121 projects serving approimately 43,000 students in 1967 to 3,300 projects serving approximately 593,042 students in 1982.

Types of Benefits Provided: Nearly all migrant children (97 percent) who received any instruction funded by the Migrant Education Program received instruction in reading or language arts; 66 percent received instruction in mathematics; and 39 percent received instruction in one or more other subjects (E. 3).

Program Effectiveness: No recent data are available about the effectiveness of services provided under this program.

Analyses of data from the last national impact study (E. 3) failed to indicate any consistent, significant relationship between pre-to-posttest score gains for migrant children in grades 2, 4, and 6, and any variable that had to do with compensatory instruction provided by the Migrant Education Program, or by any other funding source. In fact, no relationship was found between score gains and attendance in school.

The national impact study did note that, in terms of their pretest scores in reading (and, to a slightly lesser extent, their pretest scores in mathematics), migrant children in grades 2, 4, and 6 show significant educational disadvantage. In early 1978, migrant children in grades 4 and 6 had mean scores 0.8 of a standard deviation below the grade-level counterpart general population in reading, and 0.6 of a standard deviation below the counterpart general population in mathematics (because the migrant population is significantly over age in grade, the age-based discrepancy would be much larger). On the reading test, across all three grades, it is estimated that at least 48 to 62 percent of the migrant children scored

Program Effectiveness (Continued)

below the 25th percentile for the population as a whole; on the mathematics test, at least 27 to 39 percent scored below the 25th percentile. The degree of this disadvantage overshadows all other education-related factors for these children.

With regard to mobility, none of the information readily accessible to the national study revealed as great a degree of movement for the migrant population as was generally expected. Migrant educators note, however, that the greater difficulty experienced in keeping track of the more mobile members of the population (who are often unidentified, unserved, and out of school) distorts the inferences made about the mobility of migrant children from accessible records (from the study's survey or from the MSRTS). Study data do, however, permit valid inferences about the mobility of the population served: 24 percent of the estimated population of 372,000 children served by the Migrant Education Program were enrolled in more than one school district in 1977; 30 percent were enrolled in only one district, but for less than the full school year; and the remaining 46 percent (or nearly half) were enrolled in one district for the full school year. (However, approximately half the children enrolled in one district for the entire year were classified as active migrants.

Two recent studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (E. 1) and the U.S. General Accounting Office (E. 2) suggest that migrant education programs in several States are not actively serving the most mobile students. It must be noted, however, that each of these two studies had judgmental site selection coupled with a restricted range of sites. At the same time, the two studies do indicate that certain local migrant education programs are serving substantial percentages of students who are either not mobile or have not experienced educational disruption due to migration.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During Fiscal Year 1983, four separate actions were proposed to alter the scope and effect of the Migrant Education Program:

Proposed Changes in Program Regulations. On December 3, 1982, the Department of Education published a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for the Migrant Education Program. It contained two major changes: the proposed new definition of "currently migratory child," adding the requirement that the child's education must have been interrupted as a result of a move within the past 12 months, and the proposed new definitions of "migratory agricultural worker" and "migratory fisherman" which require that the seasonal agricultural or fishing work of the child's parent or guardian be his "primary occupation."

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation (Continued)

The purpose of these changes was to insure that the program serves only those whose education is disrupted directly by mobility and that funds are targeted on children of parents truly dependent upon their mobility. As noted above, several studies of the Migrant Education Program indicate that local programs may be serving significant numbers of children whose education is not so disrupted and who may not have had special educational needs caused by it.

Proposed Changes in the Program Statute. On February 4, 1983, the Department proposed a statutory change to reduce the period of eligibility for "formerly migratory" children from five years to two years.

On November 18, 1983, Congress passed a set of technical amendments to ECIA (P.L. 98-211) that amend Section 555(b) of ECIA by requiring that the Department continue to use the definitions of "currently migratory child," "migratory agricultural worker" and "migratory fisherman" which were in effect on June 30, 1982 in regulations prescribed under subpart 1 of Part B of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. 4/

Proposed Reduction in the Migrant Education Budget. The Department's Fiscal Year 1984 Budget requested $129,434,000, a decrease of $126,310,000 from 1983. The proposed reduction was intended to: reflect a reordering of priorities within Chapter 1 to shift funds toward the LEA grant program and be in line with the proposed legislation and regulatory changes outlined above.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. State of California Department of Education, Review of the Eligibility of Migrant Children for Whom Funds were Awarded Under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for Fiscal Years Ended September 30, 1980, 1982 and 1983. U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Inspector General. Washington, D.C., 1983.

2. Analysis of Migration Characteristics of Children Served under the Migrant Education Program. U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., May 2, 1983.

3. Comprehensive Summary: Study of the ESEA Title I Migrant Education Program. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, NC March 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Estimate of Migrant Population Distributed by Grade in 1977:

Grade	Estimated Population	Percent of Population
Pre-K	1,100	.3
K	15,500	4.2
1	36,300	9.8
2	35,900	9.7
3	37,800	10.2
4	37,300	10.0
5	33,800	9.1
6	36,300	9.8
7	36,400	9.8
8	30,900	8.3
9	25,900	7.0
10	21,500	5.8
11	14,400	3.9
12	8,700	2.3
	371,800	100.0%

Ethnicity of Migrant Children in 1977:

	Percentage	Estimated Population Total
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0.3	1,000
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.4	1,500
Non-Hispanic Black	13.4	49,800
Mexican American	64.5	239,800
Puerto Rican	3.7	13,800
Other Hispanic	0.8	3,000
Non-Hispanic White	16.9	62,800
Total	100.0%	371,800

Source: E.3

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Louis J. McGuinness (202) 245-2222

Program Studies: James J. English (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. Section 193 of ESEA Title I requires that grants for the Part B State-operated programs (Migrant, Handicapped, and Neglected or Delinquent) be awarded as authorized. This is referred to as "off-the-top funding" or being "fully-funded," in contrast to LEA grants that are reduced as necessitated by appropriations. However, starting in FY 1980, Congress placed a cap on the amount authorized for each of the Title I State-operated programs by specifying a specific funding level for each State-operated program in the appropriations process. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 capped the authorization for the State-operated programs at 14.6 percent of the total appropriated for Chapter 1.

2. Changes made in the law by the Education Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-561), as reflected in current regulations, include providing a mechanism for adjusting the count of eligible migrant children in each State during the summer months in order to reflect the special needs of migrant children for summer projects and the additional costs of operating these projects.

3. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System is a computerized data system that receives, stores, and transmits educational and health information on children participating in Chapter 1 migrant education projects in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Schools are responsible for entering into the system information on the health and education of each migrant child served. When children move to new locations, this information can then be retrieved by their new teachers and by school health officals.

4. Conference Report on H. R. 1035, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 Technical Amendments. Conference Report (H. Rept. No. 98-574). Congressional Record - House. November 18, 1983.

FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.013)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 (ECIA), enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 33,182,207	$ 33,182,207
1980	32,391,655	32,391,655
1981	33,975,000	32,975,000
1982	32,616,000	32,616,000
1983	32,616,000	32,616,000

Purpose: To provide financial assistance to meet the special educational needs of children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or in adult correctional institutions for whom a State agency is directly reponsible for providing free public education. The programs and projects provided must be designed to support educational services supplemental to the basic education of such children which must be provided by the State agency.

Eligibility: State agencies which are directly responsible for providing free public education to children in institutions for neglected or delinquent children or to children in adult correctional institutions may receive grants.

Formula: The grant for each eligible agency is equal to the number of children in average daily attendance (as determined by the Secretary) receiving free public education in the agency's school multiplied by 40% of the State's average per-pupil expenditure (but no less than 80% of the U.S. average per-pupil expenditure and no more than 120% of the U.S. average.)

Applicant Requirements: Every three years, each State agency must submit an application to the SEA conforming with Chapter 1 requirements, any applicable regulations, and such criteria as may be established by the SEA.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: ECIA grants are for one year. Unspent funds may be carried forward into the next fiscal year.

Transition Services Funded in Fiscal Years 1981 and 1982: 1/ Under Section 153 of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, local educational agencies could apply for discretionary grants to support

Transition Services Funded in Fiscal Years 1981 and 1982 (Continued)

projects in schools other than State-operated institutions to facilitate the transition of children from State-operated institutions for neglected or delinquent children back to the local schools. Funds were first appropriated for the Section 153 transitional services program in FY 1981 ($900,000) and an additional $864,000 was included in the fourth continuing resolution for FY 1982. The program began in 1982 using funds from both the 1981 and 1982 fiscal years. An application notice was published in the Federal Register on April 23, 1982, and 64 applications were received. Twenty-one projects were funded, ranging in size from $20,000 to $209,911 for 12 months. The transitional services provided could include compensatory education, counseling, peer tutoring, and re-entry orientation. No continuation of the transitional services program is planned.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goal and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Issuance of regulations for State Agency programs under ECIA Chapter 1.
- Development of nonregulatory guidance for State agencies services to children in neglected or delinquent institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- A notice of proposal rulemaking was published on December 8, 1982.
- Final Regulations for State Agency programs under ECIA Chapter 1 are now in the clearance process.
- Nonregulatory guidance for neglected or delinquent institutions is being developed.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: During the 1982-83 school year, 670 State institutions received formula grants. Uniform data were not collected on the participants in Chapter 1 State programs for neglected and delinquent children; therefore, it is not possible to report with certainty how many children were served. In the future, States will be required to report on the numbers of children served in their State Performance Reports. The first set of data are due on February 1, 1984.

Program Effectiveness: All projects are required to conduct evaluations and to submit the results of the evaluations to the State education agencies, but the State education agencies are no longer required to submit evaluation reports to the Department of Education.

Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Twenty-one States did report on their 1980 and 1981 Title I programs for neglected or delinquent children. Because there was no prescribed format for the reports, the information varied widely among the States, and it was not possible to compile achievement summaries. Several of the States did note problem areas, however, that included shortage of staff, inadequate funds, difficulties measuring program impact, and difficulties encountered by students attempting to make the transition from the institution back into their communities.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. System Development Corporation. Reports for Contract Number 300-76-0093:

   Volume 2. Compensatory Education and Confined Youth: A National Evaluation of Title I Programs in State Institutions for Neglected or Delinquent Youth, 1977.

   Volume 3. Post-release Experiences of Students from State Correctional Institutions, 1979.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: John Staehle, (202) 245-3081

Program studies: Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. We include this information in the FY 1983 report because grants were awarded too late in FY 1982 for inclusion in that year's report.

CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION--CHAPTER 2 STATE BLOCK GRANT (CFDA No. 84.151)

Highlights:

- o Actions for full implementation of this program completed. (Section II.B below)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 97-35, Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, enacted as part of Subtitle D of Title V of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, 31 U.S.C. 1243. (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1982	$589,368,000	$442,176,000
1983	$589,368,000	450,655,000

Purpose: To assist State and local educational agencies to improve elementary and secondary education, through consolidation of 42 elementary and secondary education programs into a single authorization. The goal is to reduce paperwork and assign responsibility for the design and implementation of programs to local educational agencies (LEAs). State educational agencies (SEAs) have the basic responsibility for the administration of the funds.

Eligibility: All States including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico; and the Insular Areas, including American Samoa, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Virgin Islands.

State Assurances: State applications must describe the allocation of funds among the authorized purposes, including the allocation of funds required to provide equal benefits for children enrolled in private schools; and provide for continuing consultation with an appointed advisory committee, for annual evaluations of the supported programs, for the maintenance of records required for fiscal audits and program evaluations, and for public dissemination of certain information.

Local Assurances: Applications from LEAs must describe the allocation of funds among authorized purposes; assure compliance with the requirements of Chapter 2, including the participation of private school children; agree to keep records for fiscal audit and program evaluation purposes, and provide such information to the SEA; and consult with appropriate groups regarding the design and implementation of programs.

Formula: The Secretary is authorized to reserve up to 1 percent of the Chapter 2 appropriation for the Insular Areas, and up to 6 percent for discretionary programs. The remainder is alloted to SEAs based on the State's percentage of the Nation's population aged 5 to 17. No State receives less than 0.5 percent of the remainder. The SEA is authorized to reserve up to 20 percent of the funds for administration of the program, and for grants and contracts to support the various authorized purposes. The balance of the funds the State receives are distributed to LEAs on the basis of a formula developed by the State and approved by the Secretary.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Funds are available for expenditure at SEA and LEA levels in the year for which the funds were appropriated and the succeeding fiscal year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: SEAs and LEAs are required to keep such records as may be required for fiscal audit and program evaluation for five years. Audits must be conducted every two years; evaluations every year.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Publish program regulations which permit State and local discretion and limit administrative burden to the greatest extent possible.

- Prepare nonregulatory guidance in a format chosen to address the questions of State and local education officials involved in program implementation.

- Prepare summaries and/or analyses of information contained in State applications or voluntarily submitted by States to inform ED officials of program operations.

- Receive State applications and/or amendments, approve amended State fund distribution criteria for the 1983-84 school year, and issue grant awards on July 1, 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Final program regulations were published on November 19, 1982. Comments received on the NPRM were favorable and generally indicated a recognition that the goal of substantially reducing regulatory burden had been accomplished.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- An expanded version of the nonregulatory guidance document distributed in March, 1982 was prepared and distributed to Chief State School Officers and State Chapter 2 Coordinators during FY 1983.
- Charts summarizing the planned allocation of funds among authorized program purposes at the State and local levels were prepared and distributed to ED staff and State Chapter 2 Coordinators during FY 1983.
- With the exception of Missouri and Nebraska, all State applications, amendments, and/or distribution criteria were appropriately processed, and grant awards issued by July 1, 1983. Missouri and Nebraska were delayed because of the arrangements to provide services to private school children in those States.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Funds Distributed for State Use: During Program Year 1982-83, the first year of program operations, States reserved for their own use a total of $83,092,771 (or 19.0% of the total). Of this amount States allocated 12.9% for administration, 7.4% for Subchapter A (Basic Skills), 73.6% for Subchapter B (Educational Improvement & Support), and 6.1% for Subchapter C (Special Projects). States allocated the preponderance of support (51.6%) to "Improving Planning/Management/ Implementation of Educational Programs," a purpose under Subchapter B (See E.4 below).

Funds Distributed to Local Education Agencies: LEAs received a total of $352,009,097 under State-developed formulas. Based on information voluntarily supplied by 33 States (E.5), the allocation of funds across purposes is skewed toward Subchapter B (84.8%) with Subchapters A and C receiving 6.0% and 9.2% of the funds respectively. A total of $35,096,861 was budgeted for the purchase of Library Resources, Textbooks, and Instructional materials. An additional $50,035,790 went for Instructional Equipment.

States' distribution formulae were examined in order to describe their characteristics (E.7). The majority of States distributed at least 70% of the funds reserved for LEAs on the basis of enrollment. More than half of the States included no more than two high cost factors in their formulae; these high cost factors tended to first include a measure of economic need (e.g., Chapter 1 eligibles, AFDC recipients) followed by either a measure of population sparsity or a measure of the presence of exceptional students, particularly students requiring special education.

Preliminary Program Effects: A preliminary survey of States in early 1983 following Chapter 2's enactment (E.6) found that the roles of State government actors were changing, that level-funding practices were being re-examined, and that ED's "policy of non-regulation" was causing uncertainty on the part of State officials. The researcher found some school officials concerned that:

- ECIA might continue to cause administrative burden because of requirements to serve nonpublic school students and the uncertainties of State and local administrators regarding types of records to maintain for fiscal and programmatic audit purposes.
- ECIA could encourage conservative responses that retain antecedent categories and procedures because of the lack of new standards.
- The inclusion of ESAA in the block grant and the reduction of funds in Chapter 2 from amounts appropriated for the antecedent programs could jointly result in funding losses for urban districts and less money being spent for desegregation purposes.

Initial Program Results: Three subsequent studies partially contradict those early conclusions. A survey of Chapter 2's effects on administrative burden (E.1) found that eleven of the twelve Chapter 2 administrators interviewed agree that there has been a reduction of administrative burden on local schools, primarily due to simplified applications, and that Chapter 2 has transferred more authority to State and local officials.

Case studies of Chapter 2's implementation in nine States (E.3, page 44) suggested the following conclusions:

- the implementation process has gone smoothly.
- seven of nine States have supported the status quo with their State set-asides while two have planned to refocus the SEA's capabilities.
- LEAs may be using the flexibility of Chapter 2 funding to support long-term district goals which might otherwise have gone unfunded.

Funding Effects on Urban/Large LEAs: An analysis of the fiscal effects of Chapter 2 on the 28 largest cities and districts (E.2) showed that these districts received a $27 million or 30 percent reduction in funds in the first year of Chapter 2. These same districts had sustained an even greater reduction ($96.4 million) the year before. Sixteen of the 28 received less funding under Chapter 2 than under the antecedent programs; twelve received more. Of the sixteen districts which lost funds, the total loss equalled over $29 million or about 40% of the total national reduction.

Desegregation Impacts: The Department's summary of planned LEA uses of funds (E.5) indicated that approximately 6% of the LEA funds would be spent on desegregation programs, a decrease from antecedent funding levels. It is considered likely that a greater percentage of LEA funds is being used for activities benefitting desegregation although not reported under that program purpose.

Of the 28 urban/large districts studied (E.2), 24 received grants under ESAA to support desegregation efforts. Fifteen of these districts lost funding under Chapter 2, eleven of which have court-ordered desegregation plans. Ten of these eleven districts received supplementary Chapter 2 grants from their States. It is not known for what purpose these supplemental funds were expended; however, in Texas state grants were made to LEAs to support desegregation activities (E.3).

Program Effectiveness: At this time there is no information on the program's effects on the improvement of education. States are required to prepare annual evaluation reports beginning with the 1983-84 school year. In addition, a national evaluation study of the Chapter 2 program is scheduled to begin in FY 1984.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C:

1. Effects of the Chapter 2, ECIA Block Grant on the Administrative and Paperwork Burden Imposed on Local School Districts, Advanced Technology, Reston, Virginia, July, 1983.

2. Fiscal Effects of the Chapter 2, ECIA Block Grant on the Largest Districts and Cities, Advanced Technology, Reston, Virginia, June, 1983.

3. Kaleidoscopes: Emerging Patterns of Response and Action in ECIA Case Studies of Chapter 2 In Selected States, E.H. White and Company, Washington, D.C., June, 1983.

4. How SEAs Plan to Expend the Block Grant Funds Reserved for Their Own Use, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1983.

5. How LEAs Plan to Use Their Block Grants, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1983.

6. The New Federalism in Education: State Responses to the 1981 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, February, 1983.

7. An Examination of Criteria Used in the Distribution of Funds to Local Educational Agencies, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., August, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

Two studies, one a continuation effort (see E.3), are currently under way and due to be completed over the next two years.

Anticipated Completion Date	Title of Study
July 1984	Nine State Case Studies of the Implementation of ECIA Chapter 2
September 1985	A Study of Local Operations Under Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation & Improvement Act

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Allen J. King, (202) 245-8223.

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401.

GENERAL AID TO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS
(No CFDA number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 95-561, Section 1524 (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$5,000,000	$ -0-
1980	5,000,000	3,000,000
1981	5,000,000	2,700,000
1982	2,700,000	1,920,000
1983	2,700,000	1,920,000
1984	2,700,000	1,920,000

Purpose: To provide general assistance to improve public education in the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: Only the Virgin Islands is eligible for funds. Since it is a direct entitlement program, it is administered by a signed agreement between the U.S. Department of Education and the Department of Education of the Virgin Islands.

Applicant Requirements: The Virgin Islands sends in a proposal once a year which includes information on how it plans to address such educational problems as the lack of adequate classroom space, the inadequacy of specialized remedial educational programs, and the inappropriateness of instructional materials.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The funds are awarded on a yearly basis.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: The Department of Education of the Virgin Islands is responsible for submitting an annual report describing how the funds were used.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

In the application for FY 1983, the Virgin Islands identified the following objectives:

- To reduce severely overcrowded conditions for children, teachers, and personnel, and
- To correct a potential water and asbestos health hazard in all public educational facilities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o Full implementation of the 1983 application was delayed due to funds being withheld pending the final decision in United States of America v. Board of Education of the City of Chicago. Final funds were released in early FY 1984.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

- o Construction of 25 classrooms providing space for approximately 750 children and teachers, and a curriculum center for the District of St. Croix serving 13,600 children and 1,000 educators
- o Renovation of classrooms, educational facilities, and school offices accommodating approximately 1,200 educators or support staff and 15,000 students
- o Performance of critical maintenance, including cleaning and repairing of cisterns which are the sole source of water at all public schools

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Congress has appropriated $1,920,000 for this program in 1984. No changes are being proposed in the legislation.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program grantee files.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program were conducted in the preceding year.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Edward Battiste (202) 245-8506

Program Studies: Rhonda L. Lewis (202) 245-9401

CIVIL RIGHTS TRAINING AND ADVISORY SERVICES
(CFDA No. 84.004)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 88-352, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$ 41,350,000
1980	"	45,675,000
1981	"	37,111,000
1982	$ 37,100,000	24,000,000
1983	37,100,000	24,000,000
1984	37,100,000	24,000,000

Purpose: To provide technical assistance, training, and advisory services to school districts that are coping with the special educational problems caused by the desegregation of their schools with respect to race, sex, and national origin.

Eligibility: State education agencies (SEAs), school boards, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, and institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for a grant. Grants may be made for local educational agency projects, SEA projects, Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs), and Training Institutes. Local educational agencies and Training Institutes have not been funded since Fiscal Year 1981. Most DAC awards are made to institutions of higher education although any public agency (except an SEA or LEA) or private, nonprofit organization can apply.

Applicant Requirements and Criteria for Awards: DAC and SEA applications which address race, sex, and national origin issues must receive a score of at least 60 points on the selection criteria contained in the Title IV regulations. Applications are evaluated according to the extent to which they demonstrate their familiarity with the need for desegregation assistance in their States, a commitment to race, sex, and national origin desegregation, the quality of the plan to provide assistance to LEAs, the quality of the staff who would carry out the project, and the reasonableness of proposed costs.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded for a one-year period. The Secretary may provide for the continuation of DAC awards for up to two additional years and for the continuation of SEA awards for up to four additional years.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Both DACs and SEAs must submit annual reports. In addition, they must comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1965, and appropriate provisions of EDGAR and the program regulations.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During Fiscal Year 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- To increase the number of SEAs participating in the Title IV program, thereby increasing SEA capacity for assisting desegregating school districts within their States.
- To strengthen cooperation between the DACs and the SEAs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- There was an 18% increase in the number of SEAs awards made between FY 1982 and 1983. There was also a $2 million shift in funds from DACs to SEAs.
- Each DAC included in its continuation package a strategy to meet the objective of strengthening cooperation between the DACs and SEAs.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Grants Awarded: The following table presents data on Fiscal Year 1983 Title IV awards (E.1).

Category	Total Applications	Total Awards	Percent of Applicants Funded	Amount Awarded (thousands)	Percent of Total Funds	Average Award (thousands)
Race						
DAC	17	17	100	$4,280	18	$ 252
SEA	36	34	94	4,871	20	143
Sex						
DAC	12	12	100	2,783	12	231
SEA	46	44	96	5,318	22	120
National Origin						
DAC	11	11	100	2,927	12	266
SEA	37	34	92	3,812	16	112
TOTAL	159	152		23,991	100	187

In Fiscal Year 1983, 152 awards were made in the areas of race, sex, and national origin. Of these, 112 were SEAs and 40 were DAC continuations.

Types of Assistance: SEAs and DACs provided technical assistance in areas relating to race, sex, and national origin such as assisting in the preparation and adoption of race desegregation plans, in the development of programs to increase understanding of public school personnel concerning the problems of sex bias, and in the development of instructional programs for students whose dominant language is not English.

Program Effectiveness: No evaluation of this program has been done since 1976. The 1976 study found that Title IV needed more Federal direction to focus on needs directly related to desegregation (E.2). As a result, many recommendations from the 1976 study were incorporated into the 1978 Title IV regulations as well as recommendations from three other related studies.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The 1984 appropriation for this program is $24 million, the same as 1983. Since the DACs will have finished the final year of their three year awards, there will be an open competition. The Department will also continue its emphasis on capacity-building within SEAs.

E. Suporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program grantee files.

2. Crocker, S., et al. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations (2 volumes). Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1976.

3. King, N.J., Thomas, M.A., & Graubard, M.H. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Expansion of Program Responsibilities. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1977.

4. Mogin, B. The State Role in School Desegregation. Menlo Park, California: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

5. Title IV and School Desegregation: A Study of a Neglected Federal Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1973.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Curtis Coates, (202) 245-8484

Program studies: Rhonda Lewis, (202) 245-9401

FOLLOW THROUGH - GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND OTHER NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO PROVIDE SUPPORTIVE SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME CHILDREN IN THE EARLY GRADES
(CFDA No. 84.014)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: The Follow Through Act; enacted as Subchapter C, Chapter 8 of subtitle A of Title VI of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35). Section 561(a) of Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 consolidates Follow Through into the Chapter 2 Block Grant program on a phased basis over three years.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 70,000,000	$ 59,000,000
1980	85,000,000	44,250,000
1981	100,000,000	26,250,000
1982	44,300,000	19,440,000
1983	22,150,000	19,440,000

Purpose: To sustain and augment in primary grades the gains that children from low-income families make in Head Start and other quality preschool programs, and to evaluate various instructional models implemented at Follow Through sites.

Eligibility: Grants since 1972 have been made only on a continuation basis; i.e., to be eligible for a Follow Through grant an applicant must have received a grant from Follow Through in the preceding fiscal year.

Other Requirements: Follow Through LEA grants have a matching requirement of 20 percent and at least 50 percent of the children enrolled in the project must have had Head Start or other quality preschool experience. Some LEAs have had the matching or preschool requirements waived. In general, Follow Through funds can be used only to supplement educational or comprehensive services already available to the child.

Program Activities: Follow Through provides discretionary grants to local education agencies (LEAs) to operate local Follow Through projects; to institutions (e.g., higher education or regional laboratories) to develop and sponsor the instructional models implemented in Follow Through sites; and to selected local projects to conduct expanded demonstration activities. Some large districts have implemented more than one model and thus have multiple projects. For each project, an LEA is required to implement an innovative instructional model, provide comprehensive services and special activities in the areas of physical and mental health, social services and nutrition; and conduct the program in a context of effective community service and parental involvement. Nineteen of the 69 LEAs participating in Follow Through also function as Resource Centers and provide expanded demonstration services.

Program Funding: Follow Through grantees are forward funded on an annual basis; i.e., monies obligated in FY 1983 will support services in the 1983-84 academic year. Follow Through was consolidated into Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981 on a phased basis over three years. As a result, section 587 of Chapter 2 repeals the Follow Through Act effective October 1, 1984.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

o Orderly review of grant continuation proposals.

o Encourage presentation of individual project data to the ED Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP). The JDRP reviews evidence of project effectiveness for many programs in ED.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o During FY 1983 there were 61 LEA projects, 15 model sponsors, 18 resource centers, and 4 research projects. Approximately 30,000 children were involved.

o Applications for review by the JDRP are being evaluated by the program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Background: Follow Through activities were the object of major evaluation studies during 1970-1980. During this period, Follow Through was considered an experimental program with the major focus of evaluation on the models of instruction that sponsors helped school districts implement. A variety of studies were undertaken with the primary objective being the evaluation of childrens' academic achievement (See E.8). After the studies were completed, various options for the Follow Through program were explored. (See E.4, E.5, E.10, E.11) Plans were made for a new generation of Follow Through studies but these plans were never implemented. (See E.10, E.11) The only new activities since the completion of the national studies have been: The establishment of resource centers at some of the sites having persuasive evidence of effectiveness as determined by the ED Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP); a continuing program of submission of individual projects to the JDRP; and an examination of the factors and consequences associated with parental involvement activities in Follow Through.

Costs: Follow Through currently serves approximately 30,000 children at about $647.00 per child. In 1982, awards were made as follows:

Projects at 61 LEAs	$15,955,957
15 Sponsors	1,534,136
18 Resource Centers	1,314,657
NIE Special Projects	600,000

(Source: E.1)

Evidence of Effectiveness:

National Longitudinal Evaluation Studies: The national evaluation (See E.6, 7) focused on assessing outcomes for children in 16 sponsored models, plus some unsponsored sites. The performance of Follow Through children, grouped at the site level, was compared to that of children from similar socio-economic backgrounds who did not participate in Follow Through. The effects of the instructional models were assessed over three cohorts (entering groups) of children on a variety of measures, including reading, mathematics, spelling, language arts, abstract reasoning, and self-esteem. The most recent data from the national evaluation were gathered in spring, 1975.

Key findings from the evaluation reports completed in 1977 were as follows:

- The effectiveness of each Follow Through project varied substantially from site group to site group; overall model averages varied little in comparison.
- Several models that emphasized basic skills showed greater effectiveness in helping children achieve these skills; children in these models also tended to have higher scores on affective measures, such as an index of self-esteem.
- Many models showed no greater effectiveness overall than the programs for comparison children, who tended to have received other compensatory education, such as Title I services.
- There were statistically significant differences in resource utilization between Follow Through and comparison programs. However, costs per pupil in Follow Through were, on average, approximately the same as ESEA Title I.
- There was large across-site variability in adjusted costs of the same classroom model.

These evaluations aroused considerable controversy (See E.9) because of the lack of positive findings coupled with methodological inadequacies in study design. Among the problems most often cited are: the lack of model implementation data; an inability to detect differences because of low statistical power (an effect of attrition); and inappropriate comparison groups with children of higher socio-economic status who were receiving aid such as ESEA, Title I.

Education Department Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP) Approvals: Currently, there are 43 validated projects out of the 61 now being funded (i.e., 70% of all Follow Through projects). (See E.3) This is in stark contrast to the earlier national evaluation of Follow Through projects and presents an entirely different and much more positive picture. In late summer 1977, 36 Follow Through projects were presented to the JDRP. Evidence of effectiveness for each project was reviewed by the panel and 21 projects were judged exemplary; i.e., these 21 projects were judged to have presented persuasive evidence of program effectiveness and to be suitable for nationwide dissemination. These 21 projects represented about 14% of all Follow

Through projects. Since that time, 27 more projects have been validated by the JDRP. Why such a large discrepancy exists between the national evaluation and the JDRP process is being studied by the Planning and Evaluation Service in ED.

Parent Involvement Study: Follow Through was one of four programs examined in the area of parent involvement. The study (1981, See E.2) findings indicated that, in keeping with its regulations, Follow Through parents are often involved in a variety of activities at the local sites. Since there is considerable variation in the manner in which sites interpret regulations, there is a wide range in terms of breadth and intensity of parental involvement activities. However, in most sites of the Follow Through program, with its commitment to parental involvement as a central focus of the program, there were more activities with greater benefits than were present in sites associated with the other programs.

Benefits:

Follow Through as Service: More than half the children currently served receive instruction in sites certified as supplying exemplary instruction. However, because sites have been funded only on a continuation basis since 1972, many children in greater need were never directly served by the program.

Follow Through as Experiment: Follow Through has provided the opportunity to gather information on what works with young disadvantaged children. However, valuable information was lost because the program was managed only for services in the individual sites. For instance, the program office sometimes required Follow Through sponsors to instruct non-Follow Through teachers in Follow Through districts even though these teachers' classrooms were being used as comparison groups in the national evaluation. Such practices led to problematic and inexact comparisons. Also, the national evaluation failed to link student outcomes with project implementation which generally obscured the causal links to achievement.

Follow Through as Dissemination: Follow Through practices have spread well beyond sites directly funded by the program. Two States have adopted Follow Through practices on a statewide basis and a recent survey by sites and sponsors indicates over 700 non-Follow Through communities are adopting Follow Through models or methods. However, the model sponsors have never been directly funded to disseminate the models even when a large majority of sites served by the sponsor have been certified by the JDRP. Resource centers were only implemented at local sites, none of which had training or experience in dissemination. In contrast to the sites, the sponsors have long and varied experience in training people to implement the models. The irony of this situation is that the sites with resource centers had to subcontract with their model sponsors to train LEA personnel to demonstrate model practices. (See E.12)

The $705,000.00 of Follow Through monies allocated to the National Institute of Education (NIE) supports four projects to support locally developed school improvement efforts which are not related to past grant activities under the program.

In general, Follow Through has provided measurable benefits to participating children, information on what works and how to measure it, and has had its model practices adopted in a number of sites outside Follow Through. Nonetheless, the history of the program is marred by the failure to reconcile the service and experimental conceptions of the program.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None. The program is scheduled to be phased into the Chapter 2 block grant program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Follow Through Grantee Reports, 1983.

2. Study of Parental Involvement in Four Federal Education Programs, Systems Development Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1982.

3. Joint Dissemination Review Panel Submissions, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., 1979-1982.

4. A Search for Potential New Follow Through Approaches. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1980.

5. Opportunities for Studying Later Effects of Follow Through. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1980.

6. Volume II-A. National Evaluation: Patterns of Effects. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1977.

7. Volume II-B. National Evaluation: Detailed Effects. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1977.

8. The Follow Through Evaluation: A Technical History. Walt Haney, Huron Institute, Boston, MA, 1977.

9. Harvard Educational Review. Volume 48, Number 2, 1978. Perspectives on the Follow Through Evaluation (A series of articles representing different views on the Follow Through studies.)

10. Planning Information for Follow Through Experiments. A series of 12 reports by 6 Follow Through sponsors on implementation and measurement of outcome, 1979.

11. Joint Model Project. High Scope Foundation, 1979.

12. A Policy Study of Resource Centers for the Division of Follow Through. The Network, Andover, MA, 1980.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. Response to GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Eugene Thurman (202) 245-2500
Program studies: Jerry Burns (202) 245-8877

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS (IMPACT AID): MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS
(CFDA NO. 84.041)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 81-874, as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, and 98-94 (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	1,309,166,000 1/	786,000,000 1/
1980	1,404,900,000	792,000,000 2/
1981	1,487,700,000	706,750,000
1982	455,000,000	436,800,000
1983	455,000,000	460,000,000 3/

Purpose: To help compensate school districts for the cost of educating children when enrollment and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities, and to assist local educational agencies affected by major or pinpoint disasters.

Eligibility: Local educational agencies (LEAs) may qualify under any of the following provisions:

- Partial loss of tax base (10 percent or more of assessed value of real property) as a result of the acquisition since 1938 of real property by the United States (Section 2).
- Enrollment of children who reside on Federal property and whose parents are in the uniformed services or work on Federal property ("a" children, Section 3).
- Enrollment of children who reside on or whose parents work on Federal property or are in the uniformed services ("b" children, Section 3).
- Location in a pinpoint or Presidentially declared major disaster area (Section 7).

Current Formula: The following criteria were in effect for FY 1983 payments:

- If "a" pupils represented 20 percent or more of an LEA's average daily attendance (ADA), then payment for "a" pupils was 95% of the LEA's FY 1981 "a" payment;

Current Formula (Continued)

- If "a" pupils represented less than 20 percent of an LEA's ADA, then payment for "a" pupils was 90 percent of the LEA's FY 1981 "a" payment;
- Payment for "b" pupils could not exceed the amount of such payment in FY 1982.
- Payments based on "a" and/or "b" children must exceed $5,000 in order to be paid.
- Section 3(d)(2)(B) authorizes increased rates of payment for children under specified circumstances to the extent necessary to enable a school district to provide a level of education equivalent to that provided by comparable school districts. Districts that qualify for increased payment rates under Section 3(d)(2)(B) were not subject to the above percentage limits, but total payments calculated under this section were limited to $15 million.

Restrictions on Funds: For those districts receiving Section 3 payments for handicapped children of military personnel and handicapped children residing on Indian lands, the funds must be used to meet the needs of these children. Also, school districts serving Indian children must adopt policies and procedures assuring that there is parental involvement in planning appropriate programs for these students. In general, funds are commingled with State, local and other resources that are used for general operating expenses which benefit all students.

Administrative Responsibility for Section 6 Funds: The Department of Education retains administrative responsibility for Section 6 even though funds have been appropriated to the Defense Department since 1982. Section 6 authorizes payments to Federal agencies or local educational agencies to educate children who reside on Federal property when no LEA is able, because of legal or other reasons, to provide a suitable free public education for these children.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was to implement the provisions of the Continuing Resolution for FY 1983, P.L. 97-377.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

Priority funding was given to "a" districts if "a" pupils were 20 percent or more of the 1983 total ADA, as required by the law.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In 1983, payments were made to 2,100 school districts on behalf of 2 million federally connected children. This is compared to 1,200 districts serving 500,000 Federally connected children in 1951.

Disaster Assistance: One hundred and nine LEAs were awarded approximately $17 million to repair damage to school facilities caused by severe storms and flooding, mud slides, high tides and tornadoes in 1983.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During FY 1984, the Department will be rewriting regulations for this program to clarify and simplify those currently in place.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses cited in Section C above:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for further Information

Program Operations:	Robert Farning, (202) 245-8171
Program Studies:	Fritz Edelstein, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Does not include disaster provisions.

2. Includes $20 million supplemental for disaster assistance.

3. Amount provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS
(IMPACT AID): CONSTRUCTION
(CFDA NO. 84.040)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 81-815 as amended by P.L. 95-561, 97-35, and 98-8

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	70,000,000	30,000,000
1980	indefinite	33,000,000
1981	indefinite	50,000,000
1982	20,000,000	19,200,000
1983	20,000,000	80,000,000 1/

Purpose: To construct and repair or provide grants to local educational agencies (LEA's) for the construction and repair of urgently needed minimum school facilities when enrollment and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by Federal activities.

Eligibility:

- Districts in areas experiencing an increase in Federal activity. Eligibility is determined by the increase in the number of children residing on Federal property and/or the numbers of children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property (Section 5).
- Districts unable to finance the non-Federal portion of the project or where the grant project has been adversely affected by a natural disaster. (Section 8).
- Districts experiencing a temporary Federal impact (Section 9).
- Where no tax revenues of the State or any political subdivision may be expended for the free public education of children who reside on Federal property or no district is able to provide a free public education for these children, the Secretary is authorized to make arrangements for the construction of minimum school facilities necessary for the education of these children. (Section 10)
- Districts that are comprised mainly of Indian lands or which provide a free public education to a substantial number of children who reside on Indian lands (Section 14(a) and (b)).
- Districts comprised mainly of Federal lands and which have a substantial number of inadequately housed pupils (Section 14(c)).
- Districts whose buildings have been destroyed or seriously damaged by a natural disaster (Section 16).

Funding Priorities: In recent years, the Congress has adopted appropriations language that overrides the funding priorities established in the authorizing legislation. The Continuing Resolutions for FY 1983 provided specific sums for certain sections: $3,000,000 for Sections 5 and 14(c), $10,000,000 for Section 10, and $10,000,000 for Sections 14(a) and 14(b). Public Law 98-8 (known as the 1983 Jobs Bill) provided additional sums of $25,000,000 for Sections 5 and 14(c), 10,000,000 for Section 10, and $25,000,000 for Sections 14(a) and 14(b). Priority rankings are established within each section to reflect urgency of need and to ensure a systematic distribution of funds. If appropriations are not sufficient to fund all projects, applicants will remain on a waiting list until funded as long as they continue to meet eligibility requirements.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

o To continue to reduce the backlog of requests for funding of construction projects.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

o Reduced the size of the backlog of eligible projects by 15 percent -- $72.7 million and 56 projects.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Districts Served: From the start of this program through FY 1983, Federal assistance has been provided for over 6,600 projects, of which 340 have been in school districts serving children who reside on Indian lands. (See E.1 and E.2)

Program Scope: For 1983 there were 29 new projects under Sections 5 and 14(c), 24 new projects under Section 10, and three under Sections 14(a) and 14(b).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

1. New regulations are being drafted now.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses:

1. Condition, Safety and Adequacy of Schools Serving Children Who Reside on Indian Lands, DHEW, 1979.

2. Administration of Public Laws 81-874 and 81-815, DHEW, 1978.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for further Information

Program Operations : William Phillips, (202) 245-8427
Program Studies : Fritz Edelstein, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Amounts provided by the 1983 Continuing Resolutions and Jobs Bill Supplemental Appropriation.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS (CFDA No. 84.148)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Public Law 92-506 (Joint Resolution of October 19, 1972). Expiration date: September 30, 1984.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
1980	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
1981	$1,000,000	$1,000,000
1982	$1,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	$1,000,000	$3,000,000 1/
1984	$1,000,000	$1,000,000

Purpose: Public Law 92-506 authorizes the Close-Up Foundation to award fellowships to disadvantaged students and their teachers to enable them to participate in the Washington public affairs program.

Eligibility: The program is a Washington-based political education program managed through funds appropriated to the Close-Up Foundation for economically disadvantaged secondary school students and their teachers.

Applicant Requirements: The Close-Up Foundation must assure that fellowship grants are made to economically disadvantaged secondary school students and to their teachers. Not more than one secondary school teacher in each school may receive a fellowship in any fiscal year and every effort will be made to achieve participation of students and teachers from rural and small town areas as well as from urban areas.

The Foundation program is community-based, i.e., local interest and support is required for participation in the program. Ellender Fellowship funds are matched on a 50% basis by other public and private funds within each community. Recipients are chosen by each school and criteria for selection vary from essay contests to interviews by teachers. In each participating community, an Ellender Fellowship is awarded to a student of low or moderate income and to a teacher from each secondary school according to criteria established by the Board of Directors of the Close Up Foundation.

In addition to participants directly funded by the Fellowship, there are others who receive grants from alternate sources of funds, pay their own expenses, or earn funds in school and community projects to cover expenses.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

To provide low income secondary school students and their teachers opportunities to learn about representative government and the democratic process.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Ellender Fellowship grants (and Close Up Foundation funded community fellowships) were made to approximately 4,700 students and teachers in 1983. These grants included costs of room, board, tuition, administration, insurance and transportation, and averaged about $319 per participant.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Including the Ellender recipients, a total of 15,916 students and teachers from 47 areas participated in the Washington Close Up Program. (Students from schools for the hearing and visually impaired participated on a national basis.)

Since 1979, in an effort to reach additional secondary school students and teachers with citizenship education programs, the Close Up Foundation Washington Seminars were telecast over C-SPAN (Cable Satellite Public Affairs Network). The format consists of discussions between Washington leaders and high school students, most of whom were Ellender Fellowship recipients. More than 2,500 secondary schools had access to these programs.

Close Up also publishes written materials including a Teachers Guide to C-SPAN; Current Issues, a booklet that examines contemporary questions; Perspectives, a book of readings on government operations with articles by leading members of Congress, representatives of the Executive and Judicial branches and others; and The Washington Notebook, a workbook designed to help prepare students for their Washington experience on Close Up.

Types of Benefits Provided: The program consists of a week-long series of meetings, seminars, and workshops with members of Congress, members of the Executive and Judicial branches of government, Congressional committee staff members, lobbyists, reporters, foreign government representatives, and others. Close Up provides technical assistance and support to local education officials, business leaders and civic organizations who cooperate to develop government education programs that complement the Washington learning experience.

Program Effectiveness: The Close Up Foundation contracted with Social Education Associates (see E-1) in 1975 to conduct a preliminary impact assessment. On measures of affective change such as political awareness, efficacy, self-confidence, and interest in political affairs, students were shown to have undergone positive changes of a statisically significant nature.

One important way to measure program effectiveness is in the area of participant growth. Program enrollment grew in 1983 by more than 2,000 participants and the number of communities or regional areas grew from 41 to 47. Every student and teacher participant is required to complete a survey on the educational content of the program which generates data for program modification. A comprehensive evaluation program designed to measure long term cognitive and behavioral effects was implemented by the Close Up Foundation and begun during the 1980-81 program year. A program review was conducted by the Social Science Education Consortium (see E-2) of

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Boulder, Colorado in conjunction with the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University. Representatives from these organizations intensively studied the program and interviewed participants. One conclusion drawn from their report states that "...Close Up has developed a unique and exemplary approach for providing enriched, intensive instruction about the federal government. As a result of their one-week experience, students appear to acquire additional knowledge, to hold more positive attitudes about politics, and to feel more competent to participate in political activities."

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

In order to improve the program, the Close Up Foundation annually offers approximately 200 administrative fellowships to a wide variety of leaders and social science experts. These participants provide evaluation information, critiques, and suggestions directly to the Close Up Foundation personnel for possible changes in the format of the program.

In 1983 Congress appropriated a double amount for the Ellender Fellowship Program in order to place the program on a forward funded basis. The appropriation provides for $1.5 million for school year 1982-83 and $1.5 million for school year 1983-84. The 1984 appropriation includes $1 million for school year 1984-85.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Evaluation Report: An Assessment of the Impact of a Close-up on Student Participants, Metropolitan Cleveland. Social Education Associates, Bloomington, Indiana, 1975.

2. Close-Up Experience: A Report on a Week in Washington, D.C. Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, Summer 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Close Up Foundation (see text). Arlington, VA: 1981. To extend Support of Allen J. Ellender Fellowships. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 94th Congress, 2nd Session. Hearings held in Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1976.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Gail Beaumont, (202) 245-2331

Program effectiveness: Tetsuo Okada, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. In 1983 the Congress appropriated a double amount in order to place the program on a forward funded basis. The appropriation for 1983 provides $1.5 million for school year 1982-1983 and $1.5 million for school year 1983-84.

INDIAN EDUCATION--FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND INDIAN-CONTROLLED SCHOOLS FOR THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN - PART A (CFDA Nos. 84.060 and 84.072)

Highlights:

- o Revised Report on the Definition of Indian submitted. (II.B)
- o Secretary Bell recommends no change in the statutory definition of Indian. (II.D)
- o Phase-out of Indian Education Programs proposed in 1984 Budget. (II.D)
- o Major Impact Study completed. (II.C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part A, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 241aa-241ff. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation
1979	$640,297,800	$ 48,000,000
1980	640,297,800	52,000,000
1981	722,214,792	58,250,000
1982	667,770,717	54,960,000
1983	775,442,755	48,465,000

Purpose: Part A of the Indian Education Act supports programs to address the educational and culturally related academic needs of Indian students in public schools and in reservation-based, Indian-controlled schools. Objectives for the program include: (1) improving academic performance in the basic skills; (2) reducing dropout rates and improving attendance; (3) increasing Indian parental participation in educational policymaking; and (4) helping public schools become more responsive to the needs of Indian children.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies and Tribal Schools: Part A grants are made on a formula basis to local education agencies 1/. Local education agencies (LEAs) are eligible that enroll at least 10 Indian children or in which Indian children constitute at least 50 percent of the total enrollment. These limitations do not apply to LEAs located in Alaska, California or Oklahoma, or located on, or in proximity to an Indian reservation.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies (Continued)

As the result of P.L. 95-561, certain tribal schools are treated as LEAs and can thus receive formula grants under this program. In order to qualify for a grant, a tribal school must be operated by a tribe or an Indian organization controlled or sanctioned by an Indian tribal government and either (1) operate under contract with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and in accordance with P.L. 93-638 or (2) meet standards established by the BIA under Section 1121 of P.L. 95-561.

Assistance to Indian-Controlled Schools: The Indian-controlled schools program is authorized by a set-aside of an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the amount of the Part A formula program. Tribes and Indian organizations and certain LEAs that operate schools on or near reservations may compete in two areas: (1) for funds to help get a school started and become established; and (2) for funds to develop special enrichment programs that are supplemental to an already established program. Many, but not all, of these schools are thus eligible for formula grants.

Applicant Requirements: Applicants must hold a public hearing, arrange for the selection of an Indian parent committee, conduct an assessment of the educational needs of Indian students, and design a project that is responsive to those needs and includes plans for evaluating the effectiveness of the project. Applications must certify the number of Indian children enrolled, and have the written approval of the Indian parent committee.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Projects may be approved for periods up to three years. Grants are awarded on a twelve-month basis. Renewals are made only through reapplication for continuation on an annual basis.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are due once a year. Project records must be maintained for five years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Fulfill the Department's further obligations under Section 1147 of the Education Amendments of 1978, which called for a study of the definition of Indian, and recommendations on possible changes in the present statutory definition.
- Audit at least one-third of the local Part A projects, and provide technical assistance as needed to correct specific deficiencies or improve the overall effectiveness of local projects.
- Complete processing of grant applications for the 1983-1984 school year and issue notification of awards by May 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- o Revised Report on the Definition of Indian was submitted to Congress on September 29, 1982. This report included new data from the 1980 Census and a special analysis of Indian Student Certification Forms on file in a national sample of Part A districts as of the spring of 1982. On December 30, 1982, the Secretary formally recommended to the Congress that no changes be made in the statutory definition of Indian. Further details are provided under Section D. below.

- o In 1982, 320 projects, representing 29 percent of all Part A grants to LEAs, had been audited and an Audit Report sent to Congress. In addition, the five Resource and Evaluation Centers provided services on request to local projects, and made 197 site visits during the year. (E.2)

- o All grant applications were processed and notifications of awards issued by May 27, 1983.

- o Supplementary information on services provided to Indian students in Part A districts under other Federal programs was obtained through the Part A Impact Study already under way at the start of the year.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In Fiscal Year 1983, 1,083 grants totaling $44,031,321 were made to school districts based on total Indian enrollments of 304,790. Based on findings of the Impact Study (E.1), 78 percent of all Indian students enrolled in schools with Part A projects are estimated to have been direct recipients of special services funded by Part A, for an average cost per student served of $221 (E-1). An additional $4,381,392 went to 35 Indian-controlled schools serving 7,490 students.

Program Scope: An analysis of the Impact Study was based on an estimated 259,735 Part A - eligible students in K-12 in the sample universe of 865 projects in 1981. Students were divided almost equally among the following grade ranges: K-3 (30%); 4-6 (23.5%); 7-9 (23.5%) and 10-12 (23%) The largest proportion (44%) of the students participating in Part A projects attended schools in districts on or near reservations, while the next largest proportion (27%) attended school in other rural areas. Others were enrolled in urban non-metropolitan (19%) and metropolitan (10%) areas (E.1).

Types of Services Provided: Most project activities are directed toward improving basic skills, cultural awareness or student attitudes, and attendance or persistence in school (E.1). Specific activities in support of these objectives include provision of tutors or classroom aides, counseling and home visits, and instruction in Indian history, culture, and crafts. About one-fifth of the projects also provide small amounts of financial assistance to students whose situation might not otherwise permit full participation in project or school activities (E.1).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness: The following summary is based on findings presented in the recently completed Impact Study (E.1).

Based on locally administered achievement tests, Indian student scores have risen significantly over the past ten years, and are now only slightly below the average scores of non-Indian students in Part A districts. While there is no conclusive evidence that these gains are directly attributable to project services, local project staff and parent committee members generally rate these services as having had a positive impact.

Evidence obtained from Indian student attendance records in Part A districts indicates that average attendance may already be at the national norm for all public school students--about 161 days per year. Nevertheless, improving attendance is a primary objective in 60 percent of the local projects studied and substantial amounts of time are devoted to attendance improvement efforts. Overall, there appears to be a slight negative relationship between attendance improvement efforts and actual attendance, but this may simply reflect the tendency of local projects to make a greater effort in areas where there are greater needs for improvement. Other evidence indicates a slight positive relationship between effort and actual impact as perceived by teachers, project staff, and parents.

With respect to attitudes toward school and self, available comparisons between Indian students who participated in Part A activities during the 1981-1982 school year and other Indian students who did not participate provide some direct evidence of positive impacts, but the differences observed are relatively small and are open to the interpretation that pre-existent differences in attitude may be a factor in determining participation in project activities.

Parental Involvement: Parent committees are organized and function in the areas emphasized by Part A legislation and regulation. Project directors report them to be the most heavily involved group (compared to project staff, Indian students, school staff, tribal leaders, and other parents) in determining Indian student needs. Forty-five percent of the project directors said the committees made recommendations (which were adopted about half the time). Parents and school personnel are generally supportive of the programs. About half of the tribal leaders, however, have negative comments about the projects, the staff or what is taught.

LEA Impacts: Part A projects have had modest impacts on classroom level curricula and teaching practices, according to school administrators. Principals of 82 percent of survey schools report improvement in overall school curriculum due to Part A projects, and principals in 58 percent of these schools indicated project materials were used by some teachers in their schools.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During Fiscal Year 1983, two separate actions were taken or proposed for the Part A program. Each of these actions is discussed below.

Recommendations on Changes in the Statutory Definition of Indian. Secretary Bell submitted his recommendations on this subject December 30, 1982. Based on testimony obtained at fourteen public hearings conducted in the Spring of 1980, findings reported in the Revised Report on the Definition of Indian (E.3), public comment on this report, and the recommendations of a special Work Group convened to advise him on this subject, the Secretary recommended that the present statutory definition be retained. In communicating this recommendation, the Secretary also expressed the judgement that much of the controversy surrounding the definition of Indian stems from the fact that this definition simultaneously controls both eligibility for service and the determination of grant amounts. . As a result, any liberalization of the definition designed to afford wider latitude to local school officials in determining eligibility for services would have adverse consequences from the standpoint of fiscal accountability. (E.3)

Proposed Phase-out of the Indian Education Programs. The Department's 1984 Budget 3/ requested $1.2 million for an orderly phase-out of the Title IV Indian Education Program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses:

1. The Evaluation of the Impact of the Part A Entitlement Program Funded Under Title IV, the Indian Education Act, Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Virginia, July 1983.

2. IEP Project Audit Report for FY 1982.

3. Revised Report on the Definition of Indian, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., September, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Selected Characteristics of Indian Students Participating in Part A Projects Serving At Least Thirty Students and in Operation for At Least Three Years: 1981-1982 School Year

Characteristics of Part A Participants	Grade Range 4 - 6	7 - 9	10 - 12
Male	49%	46%	47%
Only English used at home	79%	86%	85%
Receive free or subsidized school lunch	76%	74%	60%
Mean school attendance level (1980-81, nat'l norm=161 days)	163 days	162 days	156 days
Mean reading achievement (spring 1981; nat'l norm=50)	47.7	46.6	45.8
Mean math achievement (spring 1981, nat'l norm=50)	48.0	46.6	46.9

Source: E-1

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Hakim Khan, (202) 245-8020

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Authorization figures are based on formula which weights Indian student counts by average per-pupil expenditures in the State. Actual grants are rateably reduced in proportion to the amount of the appropriation.

2. This objective relates to an assessment of current budget policy for the Department's Indian Education Programs.

3. Indian Education: Justification of Appropriation Estimates for Committees on Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1984.

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN STUDENTS--PART B
(CFDA Nos. 84.061 and 84.087)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part B as amended, 20 U.S.C. 3385. (Expires September 30, 1984.)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 45,000,000	$ 15,500,000
1980	45,000,000	15,600,000
1981	45,000,000	14,500,000
1982	45,000,000	14,880,000
1983	45,000,000	12,600,000

Purpose: Part B authorizes a variety of discretionary programs designed to improve the quality of educational programs for Indians. Specific activities authorized under Part B include:

Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to plan for, test, and demonstrate the effectiveness of educational approaches for Indian students at the preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. All grantees are Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions.

Educational service projects to serve Indian preschool, elementary, and secondary school students if other educational programs or services are not available to them in sufficient quantity or quality. All grantees are Indian tribes, organizations, and institutions.

Educational personnel development projects to train Indians for careers in education. There are two programs: Section 1005(d), making awards primarily to universities, and Section 422, making awards primarily to Indian tribes and organizations.

Fellowships for Indian students in the fields of medicine, law, education, business administration, engineering, and natural resources. Awards are based on financial need, academic record, other potential for success, and likelihood of service to Indians upon graduation. Priority is given to graduate students.

Resource and Evaluation Centers to provide technical assistance and disseminate information to Indian education projects and applicants. The Centers conduct workshops, make site visits, and prepare and distribute printed materials.

Applications for Part B awards are reviewed by panels of outside field readers and agency program specialists. Awards are based on criteria specified in regulations. Funds appropriated in one fiscal year are generally used for activities that take place during the next fiscal year.

I. Program Profile (Continued)

Projects may be approved for periods of up to three years with the exception of Educational Personnel Development projects which may be for up to four years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were to:

- support programs that will improve educational quality and that have the potential for benefiting large numbers of Indian students (Planning, Pilot, and Demonstration projects and Resource and Evaluation Centers) with a decrease in emphasis on providing direct educational services;

- support programs that address the continuing need to help Indians become better represented in specific professions by placing emphasis on providing assistance to Indian graduate students (Educational Personnel Development and Fellowships).

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In 1982, awards were made to 54 Indian tribes and organizations and 12 universities. These grants reached approximately 6,000 children and 1,000 trainees. In FY 1983, awards were made to 59 Indian tribes and organizations, and 8 universities to serve 7,200 children and 950 trainees. Most of the 1983 grants were continuations from prior, multi-year commitments.

Five technical assistance resource centers were funded in 1982 to provide technical assistance to all projects funded under Title IV. Centers conduct workshops with project staff and parent groups in their region to improve project management, including needs assessment and evaluation activities. Of particular importance is the dissemination of information about promising practices in programs serving Indian children.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Over the ten-year history of the Indian Education Act, some 800 grants totaling more than $100 million have been awarded for preschool,elementary, and secondary projects. At the higher education level, $18 million has supported the training of about 4,800 educational personnel and $8.6 million has been awarded for nearly 1,400 fellowships.

That Part B projects have promoted the ability of Indians to become educated and productive citizens and exercise leadership in the Indian community is supported by data from a recently completed study, The Tracking of Higher Education Students Supported Under the Indian Education Act.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

The Fellowship program has a 68.8 percent completion rate for individuals seeking degrees, compared with the 18 percent completion rate for all Indian undergraduates reported in a 1978 GAO study of Indian college students. Of the Fellows who earned degrees, 96.5 percent were employed after graduation.

Of the participants in the Educational Personnel Development program, 69.2 percent completed their university programs and earned degrees. Of those individuals, 92.2 percent were employed after graduation as teachers, administrators, librarians, counselors, and other specialists. These projects successfully placed most of their graduates in positions serving Indian students.

Planning, pilot and demonstration projects provided innovative educational programs in such areas as basic skills, curriculum development, counseling, dropout prevention, career awareness, early childhood, and computer-assisted instruction. The projects serve approximately 3,700 students annually, and they too manifest examples of success. One project established a curriculum resources center that serves as a community resource library for Indian history and culture. Two public school districts adopted the Part B books, pamphlets, and audio cassette curriculum, and the Part B staff has provided in-service training for personnel in those districts.

The Part B Educational Services program has served approximately 3,300 students annually through the following types of activities: tutoring, bilingual-bicultural education, early childhood education, guidance and counseling, remedial basic skills, dropout prevention,and career education.

Sixty-five percent of local project staff responding to a survey on degrees of satisfaction with the services they receive from their Part B Resource and Evaluation Center indicated that they were "moderately" or "very" satisfied with the assistance they received. Satisfaction in terms of "helpfulness" also increased from 66 percent in 1981 to 73 percent in 1982.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

For a description of the Administration's budget proposal for this and other Title IV programs, see Section II.D of Chapter 111.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

Impact Study of Parts B and C of the Indian Education Act, Communications Technology Corporation, 1981.

Study to Track Participants in the Higher Education Programs Funded by the Office of Indian Education, Native American Research Associates, 1981.

Conduct User Survey and Performance Review of Indian Education Resource and Evaluation Centers, Native American Consultants, Inc., 1982.

Program review materials.

F. Other Supporting Data

Not applicable.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Not applicable.

Contact for Further Information

Program Operations: Hakim Khan, (202) 245-8020.
Program Studies: Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR INDIAN ADULTS--PART C
(CFDA No. 84.062)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 92-318, Title IV, Part C, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1211a. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 8,000,000	$ 5,930,000
1980	8,000,000	5,830,000
1981	8,000,000	5,430,000
1982	8,000,000	5,213,000
1983	8,000,000	5,531,000 1/

Purpose: Part C authorizes a range of activities designed to improve educational opportunities below the college level for Indian adults. Program objectives include: increasing literacy; improving basic skills; increasing the number of Indian adults who pass the high school equivalency examination. These goals are achieved through the use of materials which reflect Indian culture and heritage.

Method of Operation: Specific activities authorized by Part C include:

Educational services projects to provide educational opportunities for Indian adults. Projects focus on adult basic education to develop literacy and basic skills and on secondary education, including preparation for the high school equivalency examination. Many projects also offer consumer education and special services needed by adult students, such as academic and career counseling, aptitude and vocational testing, and job referral.

Planning, pilot, and demonstration projects to test and demonstrate innovative approaches to adult education specifically designed for Indian adults.

Grants are made primarily to Indian organizations and tribes. Funds appropriated and awarded in one fiscal year are generally used for activities during the next fiscal year. Projects are approved for periods of up to three years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was to emphasize the educational service projects, since they are more directly aimed at serving the immediate needs of Indian adults, while at the same time reserving a small amount of funds that could be

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

used for experimental purposes and for designing programs that might be particularly effective in the education of Indian adults.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Part C grants totaling $500,000 were first awarded in 1973. Over a ten year period, more than $40 million has been spent for adult education projects. In fiscal year 1982, $5.2 million supported 49 projects for more than 15,300 Indian adults. In FY 1983, $3.6 million supported 33 projects for more than 10,400 Indian adults.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

While the educational needs of Indian adults are still great, there have been substantial improvements. Between 1970 and 1976, for example, the percentage of Indians from 20 to 24 years of age who had completed high school rose by 12 percentage points.

The value of these educational programs for Indian adults is documented in a 1981 study (see E, below) which reports that most of the participants enrolled in Part C programs are seeking to update their educational level and to improve their chances of obtaining employment. The study concludes that during fiscal year 1979, 72 percent of those enrolled in Part C basic education projects improved their basic skills such as reading and math. Four hundred and twenty-two Indian adults (12 percent) were reported to have attained better jobs because of their Part C GED educational assistance.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

For a description of the Administration's budget proposal for this and other Title IV programs, see Section II.D of Chapter 111.

In 1984, the BIA has requested approximately $3.7 million for adult education.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

An Impact Study of Parts B and C Programs and Projects Funded Under Title IV, the Indian Education Act. Communication Technology Corporation, April 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data

Not applicable.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Not applicable.

Contact for Further Information

Program Operations:	Hakim Khan, (202) 245-8020
Program Studies:	Dorothy Shuler, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Includes supplemental 1983 appropriation of $1,938,000 available until expended.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROGRAM
(No CFDA Number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Since 1982: "Secretary's Discretionary Funds" (Subchapter D of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981). (Expires September 30, 1987). Prior to 1982: the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 10,000,000	$ 2,000,000
1980	14,000,000	3,000,000
1981	18,000,000	2,850,000
1982	3,000,000	2,850,000
1983	-- 1/	2,850,000
1984	-- 1/	2,850,000

Purpose: To help schools and communities assess and respond to alcohol and drug abuse, by becoming aware of the complex nature of the problems, and developing strategies aimed at its causes rather than merely its symptoms. The program strongly encourages a coordinated school-community effort in preventive education, with an emphasis on reducing the socially disruptive behaviors often associated with abuse.

Method of Operation: Contracts are awarded to five Regional Training and Resource Centers. These centers award grants to public school districts and private schools for training school teams in devising and applying methods of dealing with each team's unique alcohol and drug abuse problems. The ultimate beneficiaries of this training are students in grades 7-12; the training is provided at the regional centers. The remaining program funds go to support a contractor that provides a national data base and program support and evaluates subcontractors.

Obligations of Contract Recipients: The five regional centers provide the training and guidance in devising an individually-tailored program that is to be instituted by the school teams, upon their return to local schools. The teams are obligated to establish and maintain that program.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: The major implicit goal (and function) of the program has been to provide technical assistance through its regional centers to as many school teams as its funding (level since 1981) could accommodate. The program is pursuing dual goals:

Goal 1--To identify, demonstrate, evaluate, and disseminate effective strategies for alcohol and drug abuse prevention, and

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

Goal 2--To train teams of school administrators, teachers, counselors, parents, students, law enforcement officials and other public service and community leaders to prevent or reduce destructive behavior associated with alcohol and drug abuse.

The program is, therefore, primarily a training and demonstration program through which local agencies provide direct services to youth.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: In FY 1982, the program's $2.8 million budget provided 475 schools in 50 States with field training and technical assistance; additionally, 137 interdisciplinary school-teams received intensive 7-day training programs and technical assistance. The intermediate beneficiaries of the school-teams training were an estimated 8,400 educational personnel who received guidance and direction in the individual school programs that were instituted; the ultimate beneficiaries are an estimated 260,000 students (and their parents and communities) of the schools which established these programs.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

There are no evaluation data on students' alcohol and drug use behavior before and after the application of various program intentions.

The school-team approach has been recognized as successful in integrating parents, students, educators, and the community in their efforts to deal more effectively with alcohol and drug abuse prevention; the Department's efforts have been endorsed by inclusion in the President's Federal Strategy for Prevention of Drug Abuse and Drug Trafficking in FY 1982.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

There is to be more emphasis on parent involvement in the program. There will be a new competition for the Regional Centers.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

A report on the "School Team Approach" was prepared under Grant No. 78-JN-AX-0016 from the National Institute for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, U.S. Department of Justice, "The School Team Approach Phase and Evaluation," Social Action Research Center, San Rafael, California, January 1981.

In the same year, a study was completed by OPBE, "An Impact Study of Personnel Trained by the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Program," A. T. Kearney, Inc., Alexandria, Virginia, May 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program is presently conducting its own evaluation to be concluded on September 30, 1984.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations:	Myles Doherty, (202) 472-7960
Program Studies:	Myles Doherty, (202) 472-7960

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY
(CFDA No. 84.083)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Public Law 93-380, Section 408; 86 Stat. 554; 20 U.S.C. 1866, as amended by Section 325 and 501(a) of Public Law 94-482; 90 Stat. 2220 and 2335 and Public Law 95-561, Title IX, Part C.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$30,000,000	$ 9,000,000
1980	$80,000,000	$10,000,000
1981	$80,000,000	$ 8,125,000
1982	$ 6,000,000	$ 5,760,000
1983	$ 6,000,000	$ 5,760,000

Purpose: To promote educational equity for women in the United States and to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

Program Strategies: There are two legislated strategies to achieve program goals. The first is a program of demonstration, development, and dissemination activities of national, general, or statewide significance. The second strategy (never implemented due to funding constraints) is to direct assistance to projects of local significance to support the operation of programs of equal educational opportunities for both sexes, including activities to achieve compliance with Title IX. According to the Act, this second strategy can be undertaken only when appropriations for the program exceed $15 million. Efforts are made to avoid duplication of previously funded ideas and to ensure geographic diversity.

Eligibility: Public agencies, nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions -- including student and community groups -- and individuals are eligible to receive grants.

Applicant Requirements: A proposal must be submitted that meets requirements for Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) grants or requests for proposals.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Awards are made annually, some for multi-year projects although one year is the normal duration of an award.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: A final report at project end, semi-annual progress and financial reports are required. Before continuation awards can be made, project status is examined. For audit purposes, program accounting records must be maintained.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Operating objectives for FY 1983 have been established for the development, dissemination, and evaluation of the program, as follows:

o The Program Office makes grants according to a preset distribution of funds in the following Priority areas:

Program Priorities	1983 Planned Distribution
1. Model projects on Title IX compliance	15%
2. Model projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women and girls	20%
3. Model projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls	20%
4. Model projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration	0%
5. Model projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women	20%
6. Other Authorized Activities	25%

o The WEEA Publishing Center produces and markets model products and strategies, as approved by the WEEAP and PAVAC, to potential users nationwide. Authority for this activity is contained in P.L. 95-561, 20 USC 3342. Sec. 932.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o Sixty-seven grants totaling approximately five million dollars were awarded in FY 1983. The grants were awarded in the following Priorities and distribution:

Program Priorities	1983 Actual Distribution
1. Model projects on Title IX compliance	18%
2. Model projects on educational equity for racial and ethnic minority women and girls	26%
3. Model projects on educational equity for disabled women and girls	22%
4. Model projects to influence leaders in educational policy and administration	0%

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

5. Model projects to eliminate persistent barriers to educational equity for women	21%
6. Other Authorized Activities	13%

o WEEAP's publishing center, the Education Development Center, continued providing publishing services under a directed sole-source contract extension. Totals to date are 105,423 products sold and 14,614 orders processed. In FY 1983 there were 216 different products. On the average, 77 of each were sold at an average cost of $6.87 each.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness and Progress: A two-phased study of the WEEAP was conducted under contract to the U.S. Department of Education. Phase one, completed in January 1981, was an Evaluability Assessment (E.1.) which established the operating objectives for the program and analyzed the factors which aided or obstructed their achievement. Phase two, completed in December 1981, was a Rapid Feedback Evaluation (E.2.) which collected data on the extent to which the objectives were being met. Data collection methods included in-depth interviews, site visits, and computer analyses of sales records and coded information on purchase invoices. Production and sales data from the WEEAP Publishing Center indicate that the program has met its first two objectives of developing a broad range of products and marketing them nationwide. Most of the materials were in the areas of staff development, curriculum and career development. Over 200 products are available through the WEEAP Publishing Center.

Product users accomplished, to their satisfaction, most of the outcomes they expected. The most frequently reported expected outcomes were:

- find WEEAP-developed products and approaches useful as equity activities and projects are initiated and implemented;
- increase awareness of and achieve positive attitude changes on the part of students, educators, and administrators toward educational equity issues and women's issues; and
- train educational and administrative personnel in equity-related skills, approaches, and product utilization.

WEEAP products were frequently used in combination with other resources. While this suggests that the WEEAP products are flexible enough to be integrated easily with other materials, it rules out the possibility of attributing success directly to WEEAP products and approaches. Thus, while WEEAP materials were widely used and users report satisfaction with the materials, the effects of the materials in improving equity and opportunities for women are not known.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Administration: On July 26, 1983, the General Accounting Office, at the request of three members of the U.S. Congress, reported on Procedures for Making Grant Awards Under Three Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs. (E.3.) One program was the WEEAP. Specific information was requested, including: how and by whom grant funding priorities are established; how field readers who review grant proposals are recruited and selected; the field reader selection criteria; the training and orientation provided to readers; procedures for reviewing, scoring, ranking, and selecting grant applications; the extent to which final selections differed from reader recommendations; the process used to determine final grant amounts; and the percentage of requested funds that successful applicants received in 1981 and 1982.

Findings: To respond to the questions, GAO staff interviewed appropriate ED staff and reviewed relevant files. They found that:

- The Secretary of Education is required to set priorities for funding grants.
- In 1981 the field readers were selected by the WEEAP staff from a list of names obtained from such sources as educational organizations, other ED offices, and former grantees. In 1982 they were selected by the Office of the Assistant Secretary solely from a list referred by ED's Field Reader Outreach Program. This Program was established in March 1982 because of concern in ED that the same individuals were being used as readers year after year. Through the Outreach Program, ED attempted to identify new readers and to give more responsibility to senior ED officials for selecting readers. In the GAO's opinion, one (one percent) of the 1981 readers and 11 (20%) of the 1982 readers did not meet any of the Program's criteria for selecting field readers. They note, however, that the criteria are subjective.
- Specific criteria were used by the readers in evaluating and scoring applications. The individual readers' scores were then standardized, averaged, and reordered according to the average.
- When selecting applications for funding, ED officals may deviate from the field reader ranking. However, deviations must be explained. In 1982 the Department funded WEEAP applications according to rank order [to avoid the illusion of favoritism.]
- To determine final funding levels for each approved application, program staff review proposed budgets to identify both allowable and what appear to be unnecessary types of costs, or costs that exceed preestablished program guidelines. They then recommend a budget to the Assistant Secretary. Most WEEAP grants were funded at more than 90 percent of the amounts requested.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration requested no funding for the Women's Education Equity program for FY 1984 because their priority was to provide flexible resources

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation (Continued)

for States and school districts to use on this or other programs that meet local needs. The Congress, however, has funded the WEEAP at $5,760,000. This level of funding is the same as for FY 1983.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Evaluability Assessment of the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California (January 1981).
2. Rapid Feedback Evaluation of the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California (December 1981).
3. Procedures for Making Grant Awards Under Three Department of Education Discretionary Grant Programs, Report by the U.S. General Accounting Office (July 1983).
4. Women's Educational Equity Act Program 1982 Annual Report. U.S. Department of Education (1982).

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Rosemary Wilson, (202) 245-2465

Program Effectiveness: Kathryn Crossley, (202) 245-8877

MIGRANT EDUCATION
HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAM (HEP) AND COLLEGE ASSISTANCE MIGRANT PROGRAM (CAMP)
(CFDA Nos. 84.141 and 84.149)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-329, Title IV, Section 418A as amended by P.L. 96-374; 20 USC 1070d-2 and P.L. 97-35; 20 USC 276. (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation	
	(Both Programs)	HEP	CAMP
1980	$ 12,000,000	$ 6,160,000	1,173,000
1981	9,600,000	6,095,000	1,208,000
1982	7,500,000	5,851,200	1,159,680
1983	7,500,000	6,300,000	1,200,000

Purpose: HEP assists students who are engaged, or whose families are engaged, in migrant or other seasonal farmwork to obtain the equivalent of a secondary school diploma and subsequently to gain employment or be placed in an institution of higher education or other postsecondary education or training. CAMP assists such students enrolled in the first undergraduate year at an institution of higher education to pursue successfully a program of postsecondary education.

Types of Services Provided: HEP provides outreach, teaching, counseling and placement services in order to recruit and serve eligible migrant and seasonal farmworker dropouts who are beyond the age of compulsory school attendance. HEP participants receive room and board and stipends for their personal expenses. They are housed on a college or university campus and may make use of the cultural, recreational, health, and other campus facilities. CAMP provides services needed to help participants complete the first undergraduate year. These services include tutoring, social counseling and assistance in obtaining grants, loans, and work-study funds to assist with the remaining three undergraduate school years. CAMP participants receive tuition, room and board and stipends for personal expenses.

Eligibility: Grants are made to institutions of higher education (IHEs) or other public or nonprofit private agencies (which cooperate with an IHE).

Applicant Requirements: An applicant college or university must submit a plan and cost estimate which meet the requirements of and contain the information outlined in current regulations.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Discretionary grants are approved and awarded annually. The project period is generally twelve months but multi-year projects may be approved. If a project is approved on a multi-year basis or is renewed, carry-over provisions apply.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Grantees must submit annual financial status reports and a final performance report. Grantees must maintain complete accounting, personnel, performance and other project records.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives

No special goals were set for these programs in Fiscal Year 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Not Applicable.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

HEP Program Scope: Nineteen HEP grants to IHEs and associated public or non-profit private agencies located in 16 States and Puerto Rico were awarded for school year 1982-83. The total number of students served through school year 1982-83 HEP programs was approximately 2,305. The 19 funded HEP programs had enrollments ranging between 45 and 180. (Source: E. 1)

CAMP Program Scope: Six grants to IHEs and associated public or nonprofit private agencies in four States (CA, TX, OR, and WA) were awarded in Fiscal Year 1982 for school year 1982-83. The total number of students served through the 1982-83 CAMP programs was 471 and the six funded projects had enrollments ranging from 30 to 125. (Source: E. 1)

HEP/CAMP Program Costs: For school year 1982-83, the total funding for nineteen HEP projects (serving 2,305 participants) was $5,851,000. The total funding for six CAMP projects (serving 471 participants) was $1,159,580. The average cost per participant was $2,538.40 for HEP and $2,462.17 for CAMP. (Source: E. 1)

These figures should be compared to a cost analysis done in 1980 by Clark, Phipps, Clark and Harris, Inc., under contract to the U.S. Department of Labor (which formerly administered HEP and CAMP). According to their report, "Evaluation of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)" (Source: E. 2):

- The annual cost per student in HEP ranged from $1,284 to $3,777. The median expenditure was $2,347. Because HEP was totally a residential program, it was far more expensive than a local GED program. Costs for such local programs in New York State were $110 for the "Adult High School Education Program" (AHSEP) and $400 for the "Fellowship Education Training Program" (FETP). Job Corps, which was also residential but with a vocational training emphasis, cost $3,149 per participant.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Programs which emphasized career education without the GED were less costly than HEP because of their non-residential character. The "Learn and Earn" program in Florida averaged $843 per student. "Learn and Earn" is for an inschool population and the primary objective is to keep farmworker youths in school. Job placement rates in these programs were not as high as in HEP. "Upward Bound," which has a summer residential component in addition to weekend tutoring and remedial programs, was only slightly less expensive ($1,738) than HEP.

o The program that was most comparable to CAMP in objectives and target population was the Department of Education's Special Services Program. The latter was judged to be substantially less effective in retaining students in postsecondary education. While CAMP had a retention rate of about 85 percent, Special Services has an overall success rate of 61 percent distributed among the following outcomes:

- made satisfactory academic progress	36.6%
- transferred to another institution	7.9%
- graduated	16.7%

CAMP provided support services for the first year of college while Special Services covered all four years. CAMP averaged $1,983 per student annually; Special Services cost only $355.

Program Effectiveness: According to the study (E. 2) conducted in 1979-80 by Clark, Phipps, Clark and Harris, Inc.:

o In 1979, approximately two-thirds of the HEP participants passed the GED examination (as compared to 56 percent in 1973), and 78 percent were placed in jobs or postsecondary training or education programs;

o Historical data on CAMP participants showed high retention rates and satisfactory grade attainment (i.e., GPA of 2.0, or average grade of "C") and low non-positive terminations (7.2 percent or less).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During Fiscal Year 1983, one major action was proposed to alter the scope and effect of HEP and CAMP: The Department's Fiscal Year 1984 budget requested no funds for HEP and CAMP for Fiscal Years 1983 and 1984. This action was based on the costs of the two programs relative to the costs of alternative programs available for these students.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis

1. Summary of Facts and Figures on HEP/CAMP. Migrant Education Program, Washington, D.C., November 1982.

2. Evaluation of the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP). Clark, Phipps, Clark, and Harris, Inc., Washington, D.C. June 1980.

F. Other Supporting Data

1979 HEP/CAMP Programs
Participants' Characteristics
(Percentage of Total Per Program)

Ethnicity	HEP	CAMP
Hispanic	65.9%	95.2%
White	13.4%	3.0%
Native American	13.1%	1.1%
Black	7.3%	0.7%
Asian American	0.2%	0.0%
Eskimo	0.1%	0.0%
Age		
Under 21	82%	64.4%
Age 21 or over	18%	35.6%
Sex		
Men	61.6%	45%
Women	38.3%	55%

Source: E.2

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Louis J. McGuinness, (202) 245-2181

Program Studies: James J. English, (202) 245-9401

ARTS IN EDUCATION PROGRAM (no assigned CFDA number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583(b) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 3851. (Expires September 30, 1987) Formerly Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 95-561.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$20,000,000	$3,000,000
1980	20,000,000	3,500,000
1981	20,000,000	3,150,000
1982	3,150,000	2,025,000
1983	1/	2,025,000

Purpose: To conduct demonstration programs regarding the involvement of handicapped people in all the arts; to foster greater awareness of the need for arts programs for the handicapped; to sponsor model programs in the performing arts for children and youth; and to support a national network of state arts and education committees.

Method of Operation: The program is conducted through noncompetitive grants to the National Committee on Arts for the Handicapped and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. In FY 1983 the grant amounts were $1,350,000 and $675,000 respectively.

Duration of Assistance: Grants are made for a twelve-month period with renewal through reapplication on an annual basis.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are due once a year.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

There were no unique objectives in FY 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Not applicable.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Benefits Provided: Program records (E.1) show that in FY 1982 the National Committee on Arts for the Handicapped supported 204 Very Special Arts Festivals across the country. In addition, it held 600 training sessions for teachers, artists, and parents regarding arts programs for the handicapped.

The Kennedy Center's program supported, in part, two types of benefits:

1. the American College Theatre Festival
2. activities of 47 Alliance for Arts Education committees

In FY 1983 the Kennedy Center's supported activities expanded to include the "Imagination Celebration," a program for children and youth.

Population Served: Table 1 below summarizes the number of program participants in FY 1982 by activity area. (E.1)

TABLE 1

FY 1982 Activity	Number and Type of Participants
Very Special Arts Festivals	300,000 handicapped students
Training Programs	228,756 teachers, artists, parents
American College Theatre Festival	975 college students
Alliance for Arts Education Programs	146,000 students, teachers, and parents

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual Performance Reports, Program Files, OESE.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kay Henry, (202) 245-8213

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA, Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum level for the Arts in Education program of $2,025,000.

INEXPENSIVE BOOK DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM (no assigned CFDA number)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583(b) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 3851. (Expires September 30, 1987) Formerly Title II, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, P.L. 95-561.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 9,000,000	$6,000,000
1980	10,000,000	6,500,000
1981	11,000,000	5,850,000
1982	1/	5,850,000
1983	1/	5,850,000

Purpose: To support the distribution of inexpensive books to students three years old through high school age to help motivate them to learn to read.

Method of Operation: The program is administered through a sole source contract awarded to Reading is Fundamental, Inc. (RIF)

Authorized Activities: RIF allocates funds to local community associations which then distribute the books. Community support through volunteer activities by educators, parents, librarians, and business and civic leaders is a key element of the program. Projects may support up to 75 percent of the cost of book purchases, in general, and 100 percent of book costs for migrant children. RIF also works with approximately 125 book publishers to provide discounts on books.

Duration of Assistance: The contract is awarded for a twelve-month period with renewal made through reapplication on an annual basis.

Obligations of Contractor: Financial and performance reports are due once a year.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

There were no unique objectives in FY 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Not applicable.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In FY 1983 about 2.4 million children in 3,000 communities received books through the efforts of more than 100,000 volunteers. (E.1)

Benefits Provided: In FY 1983 about 7.4 million books were distributed. Since 1976, the program has distributed almost 40 million books. (E.1)

Program Effectiveness: The sole evaluation study of the program was carried out in 1980 by the General Research Corporation. (E.2) The two objectives of the study were to:

1. determine the effectiveness of the IBDP in generating reading motivation; and
2. describe the process by which books are acquired and distributed to children.

Lack of funding precluded the completion of work on objective 1 which would have included a pre- and post-analysis about the influences on, and attitudes of, children toward reading. The final report is descriptive of the program's activities and effects rather than analytic. It found that the program was enthusiastically supported by school personnel, parents, volunteers, and sponsoring community agencies. Respondents reported their beliefs that the program represented the only source of books most participating children had in their homes, that it stimulated greater parental involvement in their children's reading, and that it had beneficial impacts on school-community and school-parent relations.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Annual Reports of RIF, Inc., OESE.

2. An Evaluation of the Right-to-Read Inexpensive Book Distribution Program, General Research Corporation, Mc Lean, Virginia, October, 1980.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kay Henry, (202) 245-8213

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. This program is one of several activities authorized by ECIA Chapter 2, Subchapter D. The maximum amount authorized for Subchapter D is 6 percent of the toal amount appropriated for Chapter 2. Subchapter D also establishes a minimum for the Inexpensive Book Distribution Program of $5,850,000.

SECRETARY'S DISCRETIONARY PROGRAM--DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES TO IMPROVE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

(CFDA Nos. 84.122, 84.073, and 84.123)

Highlights:

- Grant competitions assisted projects to implement the recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education, including several on teacher incentives, parental choice, and school boards. (Section II.B below)

- Four programs specified in the budget or Congressional reports were implemented: the National Diffusion Network, Law-related Education, Education Television and Technology, and the Evaluation of the Block Grant. (II.B)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 583(a) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 3851. (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1983	1/	$28,765,000

Purpose: To gather and disseminate information on the effectiveness of programs to meet the needs of individuals served by the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) and to assess the needs of those individuals, to support research and demonstrations related to purposes of the ECIA, to improve educational personnel training, and to assist State and local educators in their implementation of the ECIA.

Structure: The Secretary's Discretionary Program assisted programs in four categories: (1) those mandated by the authorizing statute (Arts in Education, Alcohol and Drug Abuse, and Inexpensive Book Distribution 2/), (2) that required by report language for the Fiscal Year 1983 appropriations act (Law-related Education), (3) those included in the budget request or House or Senate committee reports (National Diffusion Network, Educational Television and Technology, and Evaluation of the ECIA Chapter 2 Block Grant), and (4) new discretionary initiatives undertaken by the Department. Table 1 depicts the funding flow for the Secretary's Discretionary Program in terms of those four categories of programs. This chapter briefly describes activities under categories (2) through (4). 2/

Table 1. Secretary's Discretionary Program, Fiscal Year 1983 Intended Funding Flow: Total, Mandates, Appropriation Report Recommendation, Responses to Departmental Requests, Secretarial Initiatives

Funding Flow

Total Appropriation:		$28,765,000
(1) Programs Mandated by the ECIA 2/		[10,725,000]
Arts in Education	$2,025,000	
Inexpensive Book Distribution	5,850,000	
Alcohol and Drug Abuse	2,850,000	
	Subtotal	$18,040,000
(2) Program and level of funding in Appropriation Act report:		[1,000,000]
Law-related Education		
	Subtotal	$17,040,000
(3) Congressional Responses to Departmental Budget Requests:		
Programs cited in House or Senate Committee reports:		[13,710,318]
National Diffusion Network	$10,000,000	
Educational Television and Technology	2,710,318	
Evaluation of the Chapter 2 Block Grant	1,000,000	
	Subtotal	$ 3,329,682
(4) Discretionary Portion, for Secretary's Initiatives:		$ 3,329,682

Structure: (Continued)

- Category 2: Program recommended by Appropriations Act report

  Under the Law-related Education Program, the Department assists projects to institutionalize activities about the legal system in elementary and secondary classrooms. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided nearly $1 million for law-related education in Fiscal Year 1983.

- Category 3: Programs cited by House or Senate Committee reports in response to the Administration's budget request

  Under the National Diffusion Network, organizations that have developed products or practices certified by the Department's Joint Dissemination Review Panel and that have Network grants disseminate information about those efforts throughout the Nation as "Developer/Demonstrators." Agencies help local educators learn about the certified products or practices through support from "State Facilitator Grants." Both types of grants are awarded competitively and may last as long as four years depending on performance and availability of funds. Contracts are also awarded competitively and for varying lengths of time for organizations to provide technical assistance to NDN grantees and to identify and assess promising practices. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $10 million for NDN in Fiscal Year 1983.

  Under the Education Television and Technology Program, contracts and grants are awarded competitively to organizations both to develop, refine, and distribute educational television programs and to develop projects and school-based demonstrations of educational technology. The Secretary's Discretionary Program provided $2,710,318 for educational television and technology in Fiscal Year 1983.

  Under the effort to evaluate the Chapter 2 Block Grant, the Department supported numerous studies and a state-sponsored evaluation conference. These are described more in Chapter 104 of this Report.

- Category 4: The Secretary's New Initiatives

  Special Initiatives in Fiscal Year 1983 included a grants competition to fund research and demonstration projects on three themes: improving the quality of teaching through incentives, strengthening school boards, and expanding parental choice. The Secretary's Discretionary Program spent over $2 million on projects under these themes in Fiscal Year 1983. Other Secretarial Initiatives were fifteen projects including new activities such as the convening of the National Commission on Excellence in Education and regional meetings to discuss its findings, or continuation of previously funded efforts (such as Cities in Schools). These fifteen projects totalled $1,192,782 in Fiscal Year 1983.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Through the Secretary's Special Initiatives, to
  - stimulate the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education through support of research and demonstration activities, and
  - stimulate research and demonstration of effective means to increase parental choice, promote teacher incentives, and strengthen school boards.
- Through the National Diffusion Network, to
  - disseminate more information in the Secretary's priority areas, especially in technology applications, adult literacy, and teaching of math and science,
  - increase number, quality, and geographic spread of adoptions of exemplary efforts, and
  - provide technical assistance.
- Through the Education Television and Technology program, to
  - continue to make available high-quality educational television programming, particularly for children, and
  - assist States and localities in making good use of new instructional technologies, notably microcomputers.
- Through the Law-related Education Program, to
  - assist sites in making educational activities about the legal system part of the curriculum.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Fifteen projects were funded to implement the National Commission on Excellence in Education's recommendations, totalling just over $1 million.
- Proposals funded included a demonstration of increasing parental choice through open enrollment across a district's schools, 12 projects on teacher incentives, and 3 on school boards.

Progress and Accomplishments: (Continued)

- The National Diffusion Network continued support of 53 State Facilitator and 91 Developer-Demonstrator grants; funded 24 new projects in technology, literacy, reading (grade 6 and above), science, and math; assisted the implementation of ten "technology lighthouses" funded initially in FY 1982; identified 600 new promising projects in different geographic areas; and gave technical assistance to 35 projects about their submissions to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.

- The Educational Television and Technology program funded 12 school-based technology demonstrations; funded three continuations of programming, storage/captioning and training efforts; and achieved over 5,000 placements of educational programs on public, commercial, and cable television.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Efforts Funded: Over 250 contracts and grants were awarded from the Fiscal Year 1983 funds: 33 in the Secretary's specific priority areas; 175 by the National Diffusion Network; 15 in Educational Television and Technology; 14 in Law-related Education; and about 25 in other areas.

Cost and Effectiveness:

- Under the Secretary's priority areas, awards ranged from about $6,000 to over $300,000. They support activities during school year 1983-84, so no data on their effectiveness are available yet.

- Under the National Diffusion Network, costs are roughly $700 per school or about $6 per student served. The effectiveness of the effort can be assessed in terms of the number and geographic spread of sites adopting exemplary projects, educators' satisfaction with the products being distributed, the degree to which exemplary practices are faithfully implemented in the adopting sites, and the gains in student performance. Data on each are presented below:

  - Spread of Exemplary Projects: Based upon figures compiled from FY 1983 project applications (see E.1 below), program staff estimate that 14,000 schools were adopting and implementing exemplary projects. More than 65,000 educators received training to use products and practices, and approximately 1.7 million students, or 4 percent of fall 1982 elementary/secondary enrollment, are being served by projects adopted in these new sites.

  - Fidelity of Project Implementation: An earlier evaluation (E.5) reported that projects implemented via the NDN were reasonably faithful to developer specifications. Similiarly, results from current studies (E.2 and E.3) have shown that NDN project adopters are implementing the new practices with considerable fidelity.

Cost and Effectiveness (Continued)

- o User Satisfaction: Results from studies conducted over the last six years (E.2, E.3, E.4, E.5, and E.6) indicate that users continue to report satisfaction with the services and materials provided by the NDN.

- o Student Peformance Gains: The most recent study (E.2) indicates that grantees and teachers in schools implementing NDN projects report improved levels of student achievement and better student attitudes toward learning.

o Under the Educational Television and Technology Program, the grant awards in technology ranged from $80,000 to $160,000; the three continuations were in education television, video-tape storage and distribution, and State capacity-building in planning and policy-making in technology. Their amounts ranged from $250,000 to $500,000.

Technology grants are supporting efforts in approximately 50 districts. No systematic data on their effectiveness are available yet.

In the area of educational television, Children's Television Workshop (CTW), the producer of the "3-2-1 CONTACT!" program (continued with $500,000 in Fiscal Year 1983) collected data on its first season. Those data from 1980 are summarized below.

Coverage: Based on A.C. Nielsen data, CTW estimated that nearly 23 million households viewed the program during its 13-week premiere season: 7.2 million with pre-schoolers in the home, 5.4 million with children aged 6-11, 4 million with 12-17-year olds, and 6.3 million without children. Nielsen estimated a viewership of 91 million households tuned in for at least part of the program.

Costs: The most meaningful cost indicator is the cost per viewer per program. The estimated cost for the first season is approximately 2 cents per viewer per half-hour program. Reruns significantly decrease this to a fraction of a cent per viewer per program.

Teacher Support: Over 230,000 teachers have requested the Teacher Guide for the program.

Effects on Children: In a case study of 66 students in 3 classrooms, one researcher found more valid perceptions of scientists and their work and retention of much specific scientific information from the show.

Footsteps, a television series for parents of young children about parenting, is showing on 94% of the public television stations that sponsor instructional programming.

o Under the Law-related Education Program, fourteen grants were made averaging just over $62,000 each.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In order to award grants early enough for planning and implementation of demonstrations during school year 1984-85, notices about grant competitions supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Fund will be published earlier in the year.

Proposed NDN program regulations will require previously funded projects to provide evidence of gains in student achievement.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. National Diffusion Network analyses of Grantee Applications.
2. Crandall, David P. and Associates, People, Policies and Practices: Examining the Chain of School Improvement, Volumes I-X. Andover, MA: The Network, Inc., 1983.
3. Crandall, D.P., C.L. Thompson, and J.A. Taylor, The National Diffusion Network: A Special Report. Andover, MA: The NETWORK, Inc. November 1980.
4. Campeau, P.L,, et al., Final Report: Evaluation of Project Information Package Dissemination and Implementation. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, January, 1979.
5. Emrick, J.A., Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network, Vols. 1 and 2, Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.
6. Stearns, M.S., Evaluation of the Field Test of Project Information Packages: Volume I-Summary Report. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies about programs supported by the Secretary's Discretionary Fund are in progress.

Contact for Further Information

Program Operations:

National Diffusion Network: Lee Wickline, (202) 653-7000

Educational Television and Technology: Jean Narayanan, (202) 254-5856

Law-related Education: George Rhodes, (202) 245-8223

Discretionary Grant Competitions: Mary Jean LeTendre, (202) 426-6426

Program Studies: Ann Weinheimer, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Section 563 of ECIA authorizes up to six percent of the funds appropriated for Chapter 2 of the ECIA to be used for the Secretary's Discretionary Fund.
2. Each of the three programs mandated by law in the Secretary's Discretionary Fund is covered by a separate chapter in the Annual Evaluation Report.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

BILINGUAL EDUCATION--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES, STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, AND NONPROFIT PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS
(CFDA No. 84.003)

HIGHLIGHTS

- Administration proposed amendments to the Bilingual Education Act known as the Bilingual Education Improvements Act of 1983 (II.D).
- The Secretary submitted a Congressionally mandated report on bilingual education programs involving parents to the House Appropriations Committee on January 7, 1983.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 3221-3261.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979..................	$ 232,000,000	$ 161,400,000
1980..................	299,000,000	171,763,000
1981..................	446,000,000 1/	161,427,000
1982..................	139,970,000 2/	138,058,000
1983..................	139,970,000 2/	138,057,000

Purpose: To develop and carry out programs of bilingual education in elementary and secondary schools, including activities at the preschool level, which are designed to meet the educational needs of children of limited English proficiency (LEP); to demonstrate effective ways of providing such children with instruction designed to enable them, while using their native language, to achieve competence in English; and to build the capacity of grantees to continue programs of bilingual education after Federal funding ceases.

Program Components: The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs administers the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program and funds 12 subprograms. Basic Projects in Bilingual Education, Demonstration Projects, and Desegregation Support Projects will be discussed in this chapter; the remaining 9 programs are discussed in other chapters. A description of the three programs follows:

Program Components (Continued)

1. Basic Projects in Bilingual Education. A Basic Project grant is awarded to establish, operate or improve programs of bilingual education to assist children of limited English proficiency as defined in the legislation to improve their English language skills. Programs supported by the Bilingual Education Act are intended to assist children to be able to enter an all-English-language educational program as soon as possible. At present, LEAs are required to design programs within a framework that requires the use of English, and to the extent necessary, the child's home language in instruction in non-language subject areas. The projects are intended to build the capacity of the grantee to maintain programs of bilingual education when Federal funding is reduced or no longer available.

2. Demonstration Projects. This program provides financial assistance to demonstrate exemplary approaches to providing programs of bilingual education and to build the capacity of the grantee to maintain those programs when Federal funding is reduced or no longer available. In addition to demonstrating exemplary practices, these projects must meet the requirements that apply to the Basic Projects Program.

3. Desegregation Support Program. This program provides financial assistance to local school districts which are implementing desegregation plans to meet the needs of minority group children who are from an environment in which a dominant language is other than English and who, because of language barriers and cultural differences, do not have equality of educational opportunity. The program supports bilingual-bicultural instructional projects and curriculum development projects.

Eligibility: Local educational agencies, institutions of higher education applying jointly with one or more local education agencies, or an elementary or secondary school operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs or a non-profit organization or Indian tribe are eligible for the Basic Grant and Demonstration program.

Eligibility for the Desegregation Support Program is contingent upon a local school district meeting the requirements of Section 606(a) and 606 (c) of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA), as amended by P.L. 95-561.3/ The first requirement is a section dealing with school districts implementing desegregation plans; the second provides guidelines concerning ineligibility for assistance. If an applicant school district does not meet the requirements in Section 606(c) of ESAA, the Secretary uses the procedures for show cause conferences established by regulations under Title VI of ESAA. The Secretary uses the procedures for granting a waiver of ineligibility described in Section 606(c) and in regulations implementing that section. A nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization may apply for a grant if it has received a request for curriculum development from an eligible local school district or one that has received a waiver of ineligibility.

Program Components (Continued)

Applicant Requirements: To be eligible for assistance in the Basic Projects program and the Demonstration Projects program, an applicant must meet the requirements found in the regulations applicable to those programs. The requirements include:

1. An applicant must establish an advisory council to assist in the development of its application. Requirements pertaining to advisory councils are contained in 34 CFR 501.20.

2. An applicant must provide for the participation in its project of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served, whose educational needs, language(s), and grade level(s) are of a similar type to those which the project is intended to address. Requirements pertaining to private school participation are contained in 34 CFR 501.21.

3. An applicant must include adequate auxiliary and supplementary training programs for persons who are participating in, or preparing to participate in, the programs of bilingual education to be supported by the proposed project. Applicants should refer to 34 CFR 501.10(b) and (c) for the types of training activities authorized and to 34 CFR 500.41 for the rates for allowable costs for trainees participating in the training activities.

4. A local educational agency, applying as a sole or joint applicant, is required to hold at least one meeting, open to the public, to discuss the contents of its application. Requirements for scheduling and holding this open meeting are contained in the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (34 CFR 75.139-75.141). The local educational agency must complete the certification form in the application package. This requirement must be met regardless of whether the local educational agency is designated as the applicant under 34 CFR 75.128.

5. Joint applicants must complete a special certification form in the application package.

6. An applicant must provide a copy of its application to the appropriate State educational agency in its State in advance of submitting it to the Department of Education. Requirements pertaining to State educational agency review are contained in 34 CFR 500.20.

An eligible school operated or funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs must submit its application for comment to the Secretary of Interior or his or her designee, using procedures outlined in 34 CFR 500.20(c).

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Awards for the Demonstration and Basic Project programs are for a project period ranging from one to three years. Desegregation grants to local districts are also for a period of one to three years. Nonprofit organizations applying for the Desegregation program are eligible for 1-5 years of assistance. Continuation of a multi-year award is conditioned on the availability of funds and grantee's demonstration of satisfactory progress toward achieving

Applicant Requirements (Continued)

program objectives. Following negotiation with the approved applicant, the Education Department Grants Officer sends notification of the grant award to the recipient.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Specific reporting requirements are contained in the grant document. Periodic audits should be made as part of the recipients' systems of financial management and internal control to meet the terms and conditions of grants and other agreements.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

1. The Demonstration Projects Program's funding priorities as established by the Secretary in FY 1983 were on serving the following populations: exceptional children, juvenile delinquents, preschool children, and recent immigrant children. The Demonstration Projects Program also had funding priorities for new projects that demonstrated exemplary approaches to the following components of a program of bilingual education: community or parental involvement, curriculum development, instructional technology, and participation of children whose language is English.

2. No new goals were identified for the Basic Projects Program or the Desegregation Program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Federal financial assistance in the amount of approximately $76.1 million was provided to 551 projects located in local educational agencies throughout the United States during FY 1983. This included 305 continuation awards and 246 new awards.
- Twenty-five new demonstration program awards focused on the five priority areas cited above, with 25 continuations also being made, for a total of 50 awards.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Costs: In FY 1983, $84,126,000 was awarded through grants to local school districts for Basic and Demonstration Projects. For the 1982-83 school year, Title VII projects spent approximately $351 per enrolled LEP student. This amount is based on the total funds awarded to local districts divided by the number of LEP students served.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness - Grants to School Districts (Continued)

Districts Served. In FY 1983, 551 Basic grants were awarded to districts to serve about 216,789 LEP and 45,896 non-LEP students speaking more than 80 different languages. Under the Demonstration Projects program, 50 projects in 23 States were funded to serve about 11,050 students speaking 20 different languages. Since the first grant awards were made in 1969, over 700 different school districts have received one or more basic grants. These districts include about 70 percent of all students usually speaking a non-English language and include almost half of all districts with significant numbers of students who usually speak a non-English language. Eleven desegregation support projects operated at a cost of $2.4 million in FY 1983.

Students Served: Title VII Basic Projects served 216,789 LEP students and 45,896 non-LEP students during the 1983-1984 school year through 551 projects. Thirty percent of the projects served fewer than 200 students, 34 percent enrolled from 200-399 students, and 36 percent served over 400 students.

A recent study funded by Title VII found that Spanish is the most frequent project language (74 percent). However, more than 90 different languages were found in the Title VII projects (E1). Only one language group was served by 73 percent of the projects, but 13 percent served three or more language groups (E1).

Two-thirds of school principals interviewed in this study classified their Title VII LEP students as performing below national norms while one-third of the principals classified non-LEP Title VII participants as below average in achievement (E1).

Student Coverage: The adequacy of program coverage depends on how many children need bilingual education. The extent to which there are programs funded by State and local governments must also be considered. For the 1982-83 school year, Title VII reported serving 159,900 children in 498 Basic Projects and 15,850 students in 61 Demonstration Projects. Additional federally funded bilingual education and English as a second language (ESL) services were provided to 492,347 students (school year 1981-82) under Title I, ESEA. Additional federally funded services are provided by the Refugee Assistance Act to 143,000 children (see Chapter 203) and the Migrant program (see Chapter 102, language services unknown).

In 1982 at least 42 States had bilingual education programs. The Education Commission of the States estimates that in 1980, State programs served 760,000 students (E2). Estimates for the 1981-82 school year are not available. The number of students served by purely local programs is unknown. If there was minimal duplication among these Federal and State programs and considering there are also locally funded programs, as many as 1,500,000 students may have been served in 1981-82.

2. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Eligibility for Title VII Assistance. According to the Act, limited English proficient students are eligible for Title VII assistance. The regulations implementing Title VII, ESEA define "limited English proficiency," with reference to an individual, to mean an individual who was not born in the United States or whose native language is other than English; who comes from a home environment in which a language other than English is most relied upon for communication; or who is an American Indian or Alaskan native and comes from an environment in which a language other than English has had a significant impact on his or her level of English language proficiency and who, "by reason thereof" has sufficient difficulty in understanding,speaking, reading, and writing the English language to deny the individual the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English. Local districts in which such students are enrolled are eligible to apply for Title VII assistance. Title VII grants are awarded on a discretionary basis.

Identifying such children has turned out to be very difficult. Estimates of the number of students whose ability to learn in an all-English speaking classroom is hindered by their dependence on a non-English language range from 934,000 (E5) to 3,600,000 (E3). The latter figure is the limited English proficient (LEP) estimate from the Children's English and Services Study which used the Language Measurement and Assessment Instruments (LM&AI) test to classify children who are first identified from non-English home backgrounds. It must be noted that these procedures make it possible for English speaking students from non-English language backgrounds to be classified as LEP. For example, a recent study among the Cherokee nation found the LM&AI test classfied 50 percent of the monolingual English-speaking Cherokee students as LEP (E19)[4].Barnes (E4) reanalyzed the Children's English and Services Study data taking an additional factor, language dominance, into account and found that over two-thirds of the estimated 3.6 million limited English proficient students speak English as their dominant language. Barnes concluded "the number of children whose opportunities to benefit from education are curtailed by dependence on a language other than English is almost certainly not more than 1.5 million and possibly less than 1 million." The current statute which defines LEP student eligibility for Title VII programs does not include consideration of language dominance.

Selection of Students: In 1976 the AIR study (E6) found that fewer than one-third of Title VII enrollees in "Spanish/English Basic projects" were limited English speaking. Consequently, the 1978 amendments to the Act included a provision that "a program of bilingual instruction may include the participation of children whose language is English, but in no event shall the percentage of such children exceed 40 percentum." What little data that are available from recent studies suggest that while improvements have been made in targeting services, problems still exist in some projects.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

The Classroom Instructional Component Study (E1) found that in self-contained classrooms, 43 percent of the students were LEP; or 57 percent of the students served by Title VII projects in self-contained classrooms were non-LEP. Several audits by the Department's Office of the Inspector General have found some Title VII projects exceeded the 40 percent limitation on the participation of children whose native language is English. The Inspector General has made recommendations to the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs regarding the procedures used to identify Title VII participants so that they may be improved to further reduce the enrollment of English-speaking students (E7,8,9).

In addition to the question of compliance with the 1978 Amendments, the statute does not directly address the question of language dominance. LEP students can, under current provisions, be English dominant. Indeed, under some circumstances, monolingual English speaking students can be classified as LEP.

Language Use. The Bilingual Education Act defines a "program of bilingual education" as a program of instruction designed for children of limited English proficiency (LEP) in elementary or secondary schools in which there is instruction given in and study of English and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to achieve competence in the English language, the native language of the LEP children. To the extent necessary, a program of bilingual education must provide native language instruction in all courses or subjects of study which will allow a child to progress effectively through the educational system.

Of the 524 projects operating in 1980-81, 51 percent utilized the native language only until students could participate in English instruction (E1). (No information is available on how long children are kept in the program.) Of the projects, 38.9 percent taught either reading or all subjects in both languages all the time. Five percent used an ESL-alone program, and 5 percent provided oral instruction in the native language while teaching all subjects in English (E1).

Teachers reported the percentage of minutes per week of time given to the use of English for instruction by subject: English (86 percent); ESL (82 percent), native language arts (12 percent); math (71 percent); social studies (72 percent); science (73 percent); cultural enrichment (61 percent) (E1).

Project Operations. According to a recently completed study, projects in local districts receiving Title VII funds are somewhat more likely to serve grades 1-3 (80-85 percent) than to serve students in the higher elementary grades (59-70 percent), or in grades 7 and 8 (28 percent). Among the goals stated for projects newly funded in 1980-81 were English skills (97 percent of the projects), social studies/cultural heritage (82 percent), math/science (79 percent), inservice training (79 percent), college coursework (68 percent), and native language skills (67 percent) (E1).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

According to Title VII evaluation reports, twice as many projects reported teaching math in the non-English language as a project emphasis as did teaching math in English. Reading in the non-English language was given as a project emphasis by 50 percent more projects as emphasized English reading. The most frequently mentioned project objective in the evaluation reports was teaching the minority culture and history, which is required by Title VII legislation (E11).

According to a recent study, three-quarters of the projects employed a full-time project director. The average project employed 6-8 aides, 85 percent in full-time positions. Most projects also employ resource teachers. Aides were most often used for ESL and native language arts instruction (E1).

An advanced degree was held by over one-quarter of the classroom teachers and over half the resource teachers. Bilingual education certificates were held by about 40 percent of the classroom teachers. Teachers had 7-9 years experience. Ninety-seven percent of classroom teachers received inservice training in 1980-81. Two-thirds of the teachers reported they were proficient in a non-English language, and half the teachers reported having taught using a non-English language at some point during their career (E1).

One-third of the project directors and half the principals reported using a pull-out approach, either exclusively or in combination with a classroom program. Use of pull-out was greater at the higher elementary grades and varied considerably by subject with 37 percent pull-out for ESL and 8 percent pull-out in science and social studies. Spanish only projects were less likely to use pull-out than were other languages (E1).

One-third of school principals reported scheduling problems due to multiple programs for LEP students (E1).

Improvements in Program Implementation. The first national evaluation of Title VII (E6,E10) completed in 1977 presented data on the quality of program implementation. Experts generally assessed these data as indicating there were serious shortcomings in program implementation. A recent descriptive study of Title VII classrooms in the 1980-81 school year reports that project directors indicated that there have been considerable improvements in program implementation (E1).

The data showed that 91 percent of project directors said they had a written plan for administering the project. Ninety-four percent of these directors said they followed their plan, and 71 percent indicated that their plan included written management objectives. The data also showed that 81 percent of project directors reported that they had prepared multi-year project plans for their initial proposal. Seventy-eight percent of these project directors indicated that they had implemented their multi-year project plans to a great or very great extent (E1).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effects: How effective is Title VII? This is a difficult question to answer. The large majority of project evaluations are so flawed in their research design that they cannot be used to assess the impact of the program. Each Title VII grantee is required by law to conduct a project evaluation. For the 1980-81 school year, there should have been 550 evaluation reports; there were 355. Of these, only 84 were found to meet minimum levels of scientific quality to explain whether or not the program had an effect on the participants (E11). OBEMLA is taking steps to improve evaluation quality.

The first (and only) national evaluation of Title VII found in 1975 that Title VII had no effect on math performance and a negative effect on English (E10). More recently, in a review of the evaluation literature, of both Title VII and non-Title VII bilingual education programs, Baker and de Kanter (E12,13) found mixed results for bilingual education. For both English and math, some programs achieved gains,some were ineffective, but some had negative effects.

In a survey of teachers in Title VII projects, great or very great project impacts were reported in the following areas by percentage of teachers: Spoken English (58 percent), Cultural Awareness (70 percent), Academic Skills (65 percent), Reading (62 percent), Native Language (69 percent), Self-Image (81 percent), and Attitude Toward School (79 percent) (E1).

Capacity Building. One of the major intents of the basic grant program is to provide limited, short-term intervention in an LEA to improve the LEA's capacity for meeting the needs of limited English proficient students. Many LEAs have received Title VII assistance for considerable periods: 314 (40 percent of all LEAs receiving grants) LEAs have received Title VII grants for six years or more; 111 LEAs have received grants for ten years or more.

To assess probability of institutionalization, the Title VII project and district staff were asked in a recent study if the project was effectively accomplishing its goals and meeting local needs. Almost three-quarters of the superintendents who were interviewed believed the project was effectively accomplishing its goals to a great or very great degree. In addition, approximately two-thirds of teachers considered the project to be a definite advantage or a vital addition to the district's educational system. However, district administrators were concerned about their ability to continue the project without Federal funding. Seventy-six percent of superintendents, 82 percent of Federal program coordinators, and 72 percent of principals said that bilingual education services would be reduced or dropped if Title VII funding was reduced or discontinued (E1).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In addition to emphasizing strongly the development of school districts' capacity to serve limited English proficient children, the legislative proposal would restructure the basic grants to school districts program, revising program goals and criteria and ending long-term aid to districts. Funding priority would be given to districts serving children with the greatest immediate need: those whose usual language is not English.

Finally, budget policy is phasing out desegregation grants.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Cardenas, R. and others. A Descriptive Study of the Classroom Instruction Component of the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program, May 15, 1983, Development Associates, Arlington, Virginia. Contract 300-79-0675.
2. The Condition of Bilingual Education in the Nation, 1982. U.S. Department of Education.
3. O'Malley, J.M. Children's English and Services Study: Language Minority Children with Limited English Proficiency in the United States. Rosslyn, Va.: InterAmerica Associates.
4. Barnes, R. The Size of the Eligible Language Minority Population in Baker, K. and de Kanter, A. (eds.) Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1983.
5. U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. Directory of Elementary and Secondary School Districts and Schools in Selected School Districts: School Year 1978-79. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
6. Danoff, M. and others. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program, Volume 1, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, February 1977. Contract OEC-0-74-9331.
7. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General for Audit. Review of the Federal Gifted and Talented Bilingual Education Project at Region One Education Service Center, Edinburg, Texas, March 29, 1982.
8. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General for Audit. Review of Federal Bilingual Education Programs at Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, Texas. March 31, 1982.
9. Department of Education, Office of Inspector General for Audit. Review of Federal Bilingual Education Programs in Texas, March 31, 1982.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above (Continued)

10. Danoff, M. and others. Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English Bilingual Education Program, Volume 3, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, January 1978.

11. Synthesis of Reported Evaluation and Research Evidence on the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education Basic Projects, Final Report: Tasks 708, submitted by National Center for Bilingual Research, Los Alamitos, California, Contract 300-810-0439; July 15, 1983.

12. Baker, K. and de Kanter, A. An Answer From Research on Bilingual Education, *American Education*, Washington, D.C., July 1983, Volume 19, Number 6.

13. Baker, K. and de Kanter A., Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature. Final Draft Report. U.S. Department of Education, September 25, 1981.

14. Rosenthal, A.; Milne, A.; Ellman, F.; Ginsburg, A., and Baker, K. A Comparison of the Effects of Language Background and Socioeconomic Status on Achievement Among Elementary School Students in Baker, K. and de Kanter, A. (eds). *Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy.* Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1983.

15. So, A. Y. and S. Chang, What Matters? A Study of the Relative Impact of Language Background and Socioeconomic Status on Reading Achievement. Mimeo. Los Alamitos, Ca.:National Center for Bilingual Research, 1982.

16. Mayeske, G.W., J. Okada, W. Cohen, A. Beaton, Jr., and C. Wisler. A Study of the Achievement of Our Nation's Students. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

17. Veltman, C.J. Relative Educational Attainment of Hispanic-American Children, 1976. Paper presented at the Aspira Hispanic Forum in Responsive Educational Policy, Washington, D.C. 1980.

18. Rosenthal, A., Baker, K., and Ginsburg, A. The Effect of Language Background on Achievement Level and Learning Among Elementary School Students. *Sociology of Education*, Volume 56, pp. 157-169, 1983.

19. Berdan, R.; So, A.; and Sanchez, A.; Language Among the Cherokee: Patterns of Language Use in Northeastern Oklahoma. Part 1: Preliminary Report. Los Alamitos, California: National Center for Bilingual Research, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Supplementary Fact Sheet

	1983
Basic Grants	$ 84,126,000
Basic Grants to LEAs	76,126,000
Number of projects supported	551
Number of new projects	246
Number of LEP children served	216,789
Average per pupil expenditure	$351
Demonstration Grants to LEAs	$ 8,000,000
Number of projects supported	50
Number of new projects	25
Number of children served	11,050
Average per pupil expenditure	$724
Special Demonstration Contracts	$ 500,000
Number of contracts	1
Total Projects	601
Number of children served	182,505
Desegregation Support Grants	$ 2,400,000
Number of projects	11

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

- In FY 1983, Development Associates was awarded a contract to begin the first phase of the Congressionally-mandated longitudinal evaluation study which will determine the impact of services to limited English proficient students.

- SRA Technology began a major evaluation which will study immersion programs in the United States as compared to more traditional bilingual education approaches.

- Other studies funded under Part C which are relevant to the Basic Grant program include:

  --Advanced Technology will be examining local school districts which do not receive external funding, but are able to build capacity.

  --Naomi Gray, Associates will examine services provided to junior and senior high school language minority/limited English proficient students.

  --Decision Resources will examine Census data to determine the number of limited English proficient students in the United States.

III. Response to GEPA 417(b) (Continued)

--The National Center for Bilingual Research will be validating the LM&AI, an instrument which evaluates language proficiency.

--MESA, Incorporated will be studying Title VII programs which service native American and Alaskan native limited English proficient students.

--COMSIS will be reviewing the state-of-the-art of education technologies implemented in programs of instruction serving LEP students.

--Human Resources Corporation will be examining the needs of and services to Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders.

--The Educational Testing Service will be supplementing the National Assessment of Educational Progress with questions for limited English proficient students.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations:	Rudy Cordova, (202) 245-2609 (Basic Program) Rudy Munis, (202) 245-2595 (Demonstration Program)
Program Studies:	Jan Anderson, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Includes $90,000,000 for bilingual vocational training and $8,000,000 for bilingual desegregation programs.

2. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.

3. Section 587(a) of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981, P.L. 97-35, repealed the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA). However, Section 751 of Title VII was not affected. The provisions of ESAA incorporated by reference into Section 751 of Title VII remain in effect for purpose of the Desegregation Program authorized under Title VII.

4. There is some concern that the LM&AI may mis-identify some students; in this case, Cherokees. In the absence of more data, some researchers believe it should not be presumed that Cherokee students who are English 'dominant' are English proficient to an extent similar to native English speakers. They believe that there are many native American students who are monolingual English speakers or who are English dominant, but who are LEP, nevertheless.

BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC AGENCIES, HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA Nos. 84.077, 84.099, and 84.100)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE:

Legislation: P.L. 94-482 as amended by P.L. 94-40 (20 U.S.C. 2301-2461).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 70,000,000	$ 2,800,000
1980	80,000,000	4,800,000
1981	90,000,000	3,960,000
1982	735,000,000 1/	3,686,000 2/
1983	735,000,000 1/	3,686,000 2/

Purpose: Bilingual vocational programs are authorized under the Vocational Education Act, as amended. These programs provide adults, who are of limited English-speaking ability, both occupational training and job-related English language skills. They also support the training of bilingual vocational instructors and the development of instructional materials.

Eligible Recipients: Applicants eligible for bilingual vocational training grants and contracts include: local educational agencies, appropriate State agencies, postsecondary education institutions, private nonprofit vocational institutions, and nonprofit educational or training organizations especially created to serve a group whose language as normally used is other than English. Private-for-profit agencies and organizations are eligible for contracts.

For bilingual vocational instructor training grants (84.099), the following agencies or institutions are eligible for grants or contracts: (a) State agencies and (b) public and private nonprofit educational institutions. Private-for-profit educational institutions are eligible only for contracts.

All instructional materials development is covered under the Federal procurement regulations for contracts. Eligible agencies are determined by the kind of procurement (8A, Small Business set-aside, etc.) used.

Applicant Requirements: Applicants under bilingual vocational training (84.077) must submit the applications to the appropriate State Board for Vocational Education for review. Applications must be prepared and submitted to the Education Department in accordance with program announcements and established deadlines. Based upon evaluations and recommendations of outside experts and internal review, the Director of OBEMLA approves new applications for support.

Program Profile (Continued)

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Awards are for a project period ranging from one to five years. Continuation of a multi-year grant is conditional on the grantee's demonstration of satisfactory progress toward achieving program objectives, and the availability of funds. Funding is usually for a twelve-month period.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Audits will be made of State and local organizations carrying out this program at least once every two years. Specific reporting requirements are contained in the grant document.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: No special goals or objectives were identified for this program in FY 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: Research was conducted in the area of bilingual vocational training, as well as training sessions (E1, E2, E3) provided.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Students Served. In FY 1983, 12 student training projects under bilingual vocational training (84.077), totalling $2,396,000, recruited and trained 1,195 persons of limited English-speaking ability. Since the inception of the program, 137 projects and 11,831 trainees have been funded.

Personnel Trained. Six Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Projects (84.099) trained a total of 183 bilingual vocational instructors, aides, and auxiliary personnel in FY 1983. Since the beginning of this program, 981 individuals have been trained.

Types of Benefits Provided: Under the bilingual vocational training program, project activities train individuals with limited English-speaking ability for gainful employment as semi-skilled or skilled workers in environments where English is the language normally used. Under the bilingual vocational instructor training program, individuals are provided training in vocational skills, methodology bilingual education, job-related ESL instruction, job placement techniques, or related course work so that they can become instructors in bilingual vocational training programs.

Program Effectiveness: There have been no evaluations of this program since 1980 (E4). That study included projects that were not federally funded.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

The Administration's proposed Bilingual Education Improvements Act of 1983 will authorize funds for bilingual vocational education. Out-of-school youth and adults of limited English proficiency qualify for vocational training in the proposed legislation. The present Bilingual Education Act limits vocational training activities to students in elementary and secondary schools with funding available only to school districts.

Plans for program improvement are to provide training and technical assistance to currently funded projects as an attempt to improve their performance and increase their retention and placement rates.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Peterson, Morris, and Berry, Dale. Strategies for Outreach Services in Bilingual Vocational Training Programs. Washington, D.C.: Kirschner Associates, Incorporated, 1983.

2. Clelland, Richard W. and Feldman, Mona A. Vocational Careers in Which a Language Other Than English is an Asset. Bethesda, Maryland: Miranda Associates, 1982.

3. MacDonald, Ross et al. Improving Techniques in Teaching English for the Job. Rosslyn, Virginia: InterAmerica Research Associates, Incorporated, 1982.

4. Berry, Dale, and Feldman, Mona. Evaluation of the Status and Effects of Bilingual Vocational Training. Washington, D.C.: Kirschner Associates, Incorporated, 1980.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

During FY 1983, Juarez and Associates of Los Angeles, California received a contract award to prepare a report identifying successful strategies used in the six currently funded bilingual vocational instructor training projects.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Richard Naber, (202) 447-9227
Barbara Greenberg, (202) 245-2595
Program Studies : Jan Anderson, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35 establishes an authorization for the Vocational Education Act of $735,000,000.

2. Section 183 of the Vocational Education Act, as amended, specifies that available funds are to be divided among the three different programs as follows:

   - o Sixty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Training Program (84.077).

   - o Twenty-five percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program (84.099).

   - o Ten percent for the activities supported under the Bilingual Vocational Instructional Materials, Methods, and Techniques (84.100).

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.146) 1/

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 96-212, Section 412 of the Refugee Act of 1980 (8 U.S.C. 1522); Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, P.L. 97-363.

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 2/
1980	Indefinite	$ 23,168,000
1981	Indefinite	25,268,000 3/
1982	Indefinite	19,740,000
1983	Indefinite	16,600,000

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State and local educational agencies to meet the special education needs of eligible refugee children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. The grants are to help schools meet the special educational needs of refugee children and may be used to develop capacity through funding special curriculum materials, bilingual teachers and aides, remedial classes, and guidance and counseling services required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American education system.

Eligibility: The program grants funds to State education agencies to assist local educational agencies in providing special services to eligible children. The State must have an approved plan for the administration of refugee resettlement programs on file with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Administration: The program is administered by the Department of Education via an interagency agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services.

Determination of Grant Amounts: This program has no statutory formula. The Secretary awards grants to States using a weighted formula based on the number of eligible children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the State and the recency of their arrival in the United States. States then award grants to local school districts based on the number of refugee children the school districts reported to the State. States may use up to one percent of the total award for administrative costs. Awards are for a twelve-month period.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Specific reporting requirements are contained on the grant document. There is no matching requirement. Periodic audits are made as part of the recipient's system of financial management and internal control to meet terms and conditions of the grant award.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Other than following the annual formula grant procedures, no new goals or objectives for FY 1983 were identified for this program.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: Not applicable.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Students Served: For school year 1982-83, $3,000,000 of FY 1981 funds and $19,740,000 of FY 1982 funds were used for the education of refugee children; 143,207 children were served for an average of $159 per child. For the same school year, $6,000,000 was appropriated under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1982, as amended, for the education of Cuban and Haitian entrant children and 11,427 children were served for an average cost of $525 per child.

The Secretary determines the amounts of the awards to State educational agencies (SEA) based on a count of the eligible children enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools in the States. For each year in which funds are made available for this program, the Secretary announces a count date when SEA's must count the children eligible for assistance. State and local educational agencies report considerable inconvenience and frustration because of uncertainties regarding the availability of funds in most fiscal years. Some State and local agencies may experience difficulties in arriving at accurate counts because identification of children eligible for assistance involves privacy issues which in some cases are governed by State and local law.

Geographic Distribution: For school year 1982-83, the States reported that there were 143,207 eligible refugee children enrolled in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The seven States with the largest refugee children enrollments have a total of 84,740 refugee children or 61 percent of the total refugee children enrollment. California alone accounted for 33 percent of the total.

Enrollment Decrease. Between school year 1981 and 1982, total refugee children enrollment decreased by 16.5 percent. Thirty-eight States showed a decrease in refugee children enrollment and 11 States showed an in-increase. States with large refugee children enrollments, California, Pennsylvania, New York, and Oregon showed a 13 percent decrease.

Instructional Methods. Bilingual education was used in 17 States (required by State law in four States). In addition, thirteen States used ESL, 13 States used ESL/bilingual, and 10 States operated a tutorial program. Thirty-one States operated summer programs. Many local educators are making extensive use of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, the regional Bilingual Education Service Centers and the Indochinese Materials Center in Kansas City, but the use of these resources is spotty.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Duration of Program. An evaluability assessment of this program (E1) found that the average estimated length of supplementary services is 2.8 years for the elementary level and 3.3 years for the secondary level.

SEA-identified Problems: The major problem identified by SEA staff was lack of bilingual school staff. Cultural differences were a second important problem. Eleven States complained about lack of funds and the uncertainties of the funding schedule. A 1982 study found that in past years, awards to SEAs were miscalculated, necessitating corrections and re-corrections that have caused some SEA personnel to lose confidence in Federal administration of the program. The Department has since taken steps to correct these problems.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Jung, Steven M. et al. Evaluability Assessment of the Transition Program for Refugee Children. Palo Alto, California: The American Institutes of Research, September 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

Not applicable.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jonathan Chang, (202) 245-2822
Program Studies : Jan Anderson, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. During fiscal years 1980-1983, Congress also made special appropriations to meet the special educational needs of the Cuban and Haitian entrant children. The Secretary of Education requested and received a FY 1980 appropriation of $7.7 million under Section 303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended. Fiscal year funding for Cuban and Haitian entrants for 1981 ($6 million), 1982

Notes (Continued)

($5.7 million), and 1983 ($5 million) was made available under Section 501(a) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, as amended. Appropriation language limited eligibility for FY 1981, 1982, and 1983 funds to those school districts with at least 10,000 entrants enrolled in the districts' schools.

2. Appropriations under this authority were made to the Department of Health and Human Services and were then transferred to the Department of Education. These appropriations do not include funds for Cuban and Haitian entrants.

3. Appropriations made in FY 1981 were used for a two-year period.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION TRAINING PROGRAMS--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION OR NONPROFIT PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

(CFDA No. 84.003)

Highlights

- The Office for Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs initiated a phase-down of the Fellowship and phase-out of Schools of Education Projects Programs (II-D).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 3221-3261.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 232,000,000	$ 161,400,000
1980	299,000,000	171,763,000
1981	446,000,000 1/	161,427,000
1982	139,970,000 2/	138,058,000
1983	139,970,000 2/	138,057,000

Purpose: Training Programs, School of Education Projects, and Fellowship Projects provide financial assistance to local education agencies, institutions of higher education (IHEs), State educational agencies and nonprofit private organizations to provide training and develop capacities to train individuals who are participating in or are preparing to participate in programs of bilingual education.

Program Components:

1. Training Projects. This program provides financial assistance to establish, operate, or improve training programs to train bilingual education teachers and to train administrators, paraprofessionals, parents and other personnel participating or preparing to participate in bilingual education programs. Three types of projects are funded under this program:

- Projects that provide undergraduate and graduate degree-oriented training, and develop and improve training programs at IHE's;
- Projects that provide non-degree training to improve the skills of parents and educational personnel participating in programs of bilingual education; and
- Projects that provide training to State educational agency personnel to improve their skills in carrying out their responsibilities with regard to programs of bilingual education.

Program Components (Continued)

2. Schools of Education Projects. This program provides financial assistance to institutions of higher education to develop or expand their capacity to provide degree-granting bilingual education training programs. Funds are used to pay salaries of instructors in bilingual education, with a declining Federal share of costs over the three-year grant. If the participating university provides tenure, it must provide equal opportunity for tenure to the faculty member(s) hired for the project.

3. Fellowship Program. This program provides fellowship assistance to full-time graduate students in post-master's degree programs who are preparing to become trainers of teachers of bilingual education. The statute and regulations require a recipient to work in authorized activities for a period of time equivalent to the time for which the student received assistance under the program or pay back the assistance received.

Eligibility:

1. Training Projects. Those eligible for assistance under this program are a local school district; a State education agency; an institution of higher education or a nonprofit private organization that applies after consultation with one or more school districts or with a State education agency; or an institution of higher education or a nonprofit private organization that applies jointly with one or more school districts or with a State education agency.

2. Schools of Education Projects. Those eligible for assistance under this program are an institution of higher education with a school, department, or college of education or a bilingual education training program. Applicants must apply after consultation with one or more local school districts or with a State education agency or an institution of higher education with a school, department, or college of education or a bilingual education training program that applies jointly with one or more local school districts or with a State education agency.

3. Fellowship Program. An institution of higher education that offers a program of study leading to a degree above the master's level in the field of training teachers for bilingual education is eligible to participate in this program. An individual is eligible to apply for a fellowship under this program if this individual: (1) is a citizen, a national or a permanent resident of the United States; (2) is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose and can provide evidence from the Immigration and Naturalization Service of his or her intent to become a permanent resident; or (3) is a permanent resident of the American territories; and (4) has been accepted for enrollment as a full-time student in a course of study offered by an institution of higher education approved for participation in this program. The course of study must lead to a degree

Program Components (Continued)

above the Master's level in the field of training teachers for bilingual education.

Applicant Requirements:

1. Training Projects: To be eligible for assistance, an applicant must meet the requirements found in regulations applicable to this program, including the following:

- A local educational agency, applying as either a sole or joint applicant, is required to hold at least one meeting, open to the public, to discuss the contents of its application. The local educational agency must complete the certification form in the program information package.
- Joint applicants must complete a special certification form in the program information package.
- An applicant must provide a review copy of its application to the appropriate State educational agency in its State in advance of submitting it to the Department of Education.
- Certain applicants must establish an advisory council to assist in the development of an application.

2. Schools of Education Projects.

- An applicant must provide a review copy of its application to the appropriate State education agency in its State in advance of submitting it to the Department of Education.

3. Fellowship Program.

- An institution of higher education submits an application for participation which provides evidence of the institution's eligibility and addresses the criteria in the program regulations.
- An individual submits an application for a fellowship to the participating institution(s) of higher education which he or she is attending or wishes to attend.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants to entities other than local school districts are awarded for a period of one to three years. Grants to entities other than local school districts are awarded for a period from one to five years and are subject to the procedures and criteria in EDGAR for setting the project period and determining whether to make a continuation award. However, in the case of an application under the School of Education Projects Program, the Secretary approves a project period of three years.

Applicant Requirements (Continued)

In the Fellowship Program, applications from institutions of higher education are approved for a period of from one to five years. Actual fellowship awards by the institutions are approved for one year although students may be awarded fellowships for a maximum of two years, if maintaining satisfactory progress in a post-master's program and up to a maximum of three years, if maintaining satisfactory progress in a doctoral program.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to the Training Project Program were as follows:

- Fund programs proposing to certify bilingual teachers in science, math, and educational technology.
- Fund training programs designed to encourage parents to work toward a degree or credential in bilingual education.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- OBEMLA provided financial support to 136 institutions of higher education that have trained and/or certified 6,200 bilingual education teachers.
- Approximately one-fourth of all teachers with bilingual academic training were trained in programs receiving support from ESEA Title VII (E3).
- Twenty-five projects were funded to improve the skills of parents and others in carrying out their responsibilities in programs of bilingual education.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

FY 1983 awards totalled $13.9 million for 136 undergraduate and graduate training projects. An additional $2.2 million was awarded for 22 short-term training institutes and $448,000 was awarded for 8 SEA training projects.

During FY 1983, 427 fellowships were awarded at 33 institutions of higher education, totalling $3.6 million. During the period 1975-1982, 312 students received a degree through the Bilingual Fellowship Program. Spanish was the non-English language of 80 percent of the graduates. Post-graduation employment was found in college teaching by 40 percent of the graduates, in administrative positions (23 percent), as teachers (13 percent), and as local school specialists (11 percent). Males accounted for 47 percent of the graduates (E5).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

There are two principal questions to consider in assessing the training programs. First, what is the quality of training provided? No information is available on this issue other than information on the number of teachers who are working in programs of bilingual education who have been trained in Title VII teacher training programs. Second, how much training is needed? The number of trained bilingual teachers needed depends on (1) the number of students needing bilingual education, (2) what constitutes a trained teacher and (3) how many trained teachers are now available.

1. Eligible Population. The question of how many students need bilingual instruction is addressed in Chapter 201, the Title VII Bilingual Program. Depending on the instructional needs of the LEP students being served and how they are defined, there are somewhere between 1 million and 3,600,000 students needing bilingual education.

2. Training of Bilingual Teachers. Not all teachers who instruct limited English proficient students have received formal training in either ESL methods or in bilingual education. Some ESL or bilingual education training was reported by 344,800 teachers, but full bilingual training including (1) non-English language arts, (2) teaching non-language subjects in a non-English language, (3) bicultural, and (4) ESL was reported by only 33,500 teachers. Training in ESL alone was reported by 30,100 teachers and an additional 103,600 teachers had training in both ESL and bilingual methods (E4).

Degrees Granted. Colleges and universities reported granting 3,782 Bachelor's degrees and 2,931 Master's degrees in bilingual education in the three years beginning with the 1977-78 school year. Title VII funded programs produced 63 percent of the Bachelor graduates and 75 percent of the Master's degree holders. The number of Bachelor degrees per year increased 25 percent between 1977-78 and 1979-80. Master's degrees increased 12 percent (E3).

Federal Stipends. Over half the enrolled students are receiving some financial support from Title VII.

Teachers Trained by Title VII. According to the 1982 Teacher Language Skills Survey, 39,100 teachers have received some Title VII provided training which represents 16 percent of all teachers with some bilingual training. Only 2,400 (6 percent) of the Title VII trained teachers received ESL-only training. Title VII trained teachers were slightly more likely to be working in a bilingual or ESL program in the 1980-81 school year than were teachers with other bilingual education backgrounds. Of the 39,100 Title VII trained teachers, 22,100 (57 percent) were teaching in a bilingual or ESL program compared to 49 percent of all teachers with some formal academic training in bilingual education. Prior to

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

1976, 12,700 teachers graduated from college with Title VII provided academic preparation. An additional 11,500 Title VII prepared teachers graduated between 1976 and 1980 (E4).

Enrollment Levels. For the 1981-82 school year, 5,891 students were enrolled in Title VII supported training programs. In 1979-80, 3,472 students were enrolled in Title VII supported training programs. During the year an additional 927 students were enrolled in non-Title VII programs. Within the Title VII supported program, there were 1,311 students enrolled in Bachelor's level programs, 887 at the Masters level and 294 Doctoral students (E3).

Spanish was the non-English language of 86 percent of the enrollees in Bachelor's programs and of 95 percent of the enrollees in Masters programs. Non-Title VII programs were not as heavily concentrated in Spanish. An RMC study of Title VII and non-Title VII Teacher Training programs completed in 1981 indicated that 79 percent of enrollees at all levels were native speakers of a non-English language, usually Spanish. Eighty-six percent of enrollees were fluent in a non-English language (E3).

Curriculum Content: Courses on culture are the most frequent curricular area in bilingual education teacher training programs. Looking across associate of arts (AA) programs, bachelor of arts (BA) programs, masters programs (MA), and doctoral programs (EdD) the percent of curriculum devoted to culture was 32 percent, 25 percent, 19 percent, and 23 percent, respectively. The percent of the curriculum devoted to general issues in bilingual education from the AA to EdD level was 11 percent, 15 percent, 16 percent, and 15 percent, respectively. Teaching English as a second language courses were a low priority of bilingual education teacher curricula with no courses offered in AA programs and 7 percent, 7 percent, and 5 percent of these courses being offered to BAs, MAs, and EdDs (E3).

Language Proficiency Requirements. Nearly all projects (92 percent) had a language proficiency requirement for the non-English language. Most programs had no requirement of English proficiency beyond those of the university as a whole. A non-English language was the native tongue of 74 percent of the students (E3).

Length of Program Operation. The average program was 4.7 years old in 1980.

Room to Expand Training. Nearly half (42 percent) of the Title VII projects reported they could increase enrollment at the current level of resources. Over half (55 percent) of the projects reported difficulty in recruiting students. The most often mentioned problems were lack of student financial support and not enough staff time available for recruiting activities. Attracting people to the teaching profession is another problem because of low salaries (E3).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Project Continuation. Based on consideration of a number of factors, the evaluation contractor estimated that 43 percent of the projects would continue if Federal funds were lost, 34 percent would terminate, and it was unclear for 23 percent. The degree of institutionalization was much less for Doctoral programs than for programs at other levels (E4).

3. Teacher Availability. Various studies have estimated the need for bilingual teachers as ranging from 43,500 to 99,500 (E1,E2). The recent Teacher Language Skills Survey found there were 140,000 teachers with experience in teaching in a non-English language (32,900 of these teachers reported Spanish was their mother tongue). In addition to these teachers with experience in teaching using non-English languages, an additional 258,000 teachers reported experience in teaching ESL. Far fewer teachers were trained in bilingual education (E4).

Prior to 1976, 12,000 teachers active in 1980-81 completed a college program of bilingual teacher preparation. Between 1976 and 1980, an additional 11,000 teachers completed training. Of the total 24,000 teachers who had completed a bilingual academic program, 16,000 were using either ESL or a non-English language in their 1980-81 teaching position (E4).

It is important to note that most of the teachers with experience in teaching limited English proficient students were not employed in their field in 1980-81. Only 55,500 (40 percent) of the 140,000 teachers with experience in teaching using a non-English language were employed in jobs using the non-English language during the 1980-81 school year. Only 103,000 (40 percent) of the 258,000 ESL-only experienced teachers were teaching an ESL program that year (E4).

Teacher utilization improves when training is considered. Of the 92,600 teachers with some formal bilingual academic training, almost half (43,300) were currently teaching in a bilingual or ESL program. Of the 26,400 teachers with full academic bilingual credentials, 17,000 (64 percent) were teaching in a bilingual or ESL program (E4).

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

In addition to supporting college level programs, Title VII also supports in-service training through the Basic and Demonstration Projects Program. Among active teachers in 1980-81, 95,000 had received some in-service training including 21,000 teachers who had received no college preparation in bilingual education (E4).

POST-TRAINING EMPLOYMENT

Post-graduation employment found 80 percent of the teacher graduates and 86 percent of the teacher trainer graduates were working in some capacity in bilingual/bicultural education. Teacher graduates who received Title

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

VII support were no more likely to be working in the field than teacher graduates who did not receive Title VII assistance. Teacher trainers who received Title VII support were more likely to be employed in bilingual/bicultural programs than non-Title VII supported teacher trainers (E3).

Teachers Not Working in Their Field. Although 47,500 teachers with some ESL training were not employed in ESL teaching, 71,300 currently practicing ESL teachers reported they had not received training in ESL methods. Of those teachers with some bilingual training, 63,100 were not teaching in a bilingual or ESL program in the 1980-81 school year. However, bilingual programs employed 20,200 teachers who had no bilingual training (E4).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The budget policy for 1984 continues efforts begun in 1983 to streamline and focus the bilingual education program, including emphasizing development of State and local capacity in bilingual education and phasing out programs of lower priority, including training programs. Reductions will be made through (1) phasing out the fellowship and schools of education programs, (2) phasing down the short-term training institutes programs, and (3) removing State educational agency training from the Training Projects Program and placing it in the SEA assistance program under Support Services.

Funding for the schools of education program ($500,000) will be provided for continuation awards only, with the intent of phasing it out by 1985. The intent of budget policy is also to phase out the fellowship program. These programs have contributed successfully to increasing the number of doctoral students and graduates in bilingual education and have developed capacity in institutions of higher education in 26 States. They implement functions that can now be carried out by the institutions themselves and by individual students using alternative sources of aid available through Federal postsecondary education programs such as the Guaranteed Student Loan Program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Reisner, E.R. The Availability of Bilingual Education Teachers in Baker, K. and de Kanter, A. (eds.) Bilingual Education: A Reappraisal of Federal Policy. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1983.

2. Kaskowitz, D., Binkly, J., and Johnson, D. A Study of Teacher Training Programs in Bilingual Education. Volume II. The Supply and Demand for Bilingual Education Teachers. Los Altos, Ca.: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

3. Binkley, J.L. and Johnson, D.M. A Study of Teacher Training Programs in Bilingual Education. Volume I. Program Descriptions. Los Altos, Ca.: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above (Continued)

4. Final Report of the 1980-81 Teachers Language Skills Survey, InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., Rosslyn, Va.: May 1983. Contract 300-80-0831.

5. Maria, A.F., The Effects of the Federal Bilingual Education Fellowship Program on Fellows' Job Placement, Training Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Professional Growth. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education, Catholic University of America, February 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Supplementary Budget Sheet

	1983 Actual
Training Programs	$ 21,288,000
Fellowship program	$ 3,626,000
Number of fellows	427
Number of projects	33
Schools of Education projects	$ 824,000
Number of projects	24
IHE graduate/undergraduate	$ 14,088,000
Number of students	6,200
Number of programs	136
Short-term training institutes	$ 2,300,000
Number of participants	3,833
Number of programs	21
SEA training projects	$ 450,000
Number of projects	8

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

In FY 1983, Arawak Consulting Corporation was awarded a contract to examine in-service training. The objectives of the study are to identify alternatives for inservice staff development and then to implement the alternatives to determine their relative effectiveness and management and cost demands.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operation: Charlie Miller, (202) 245-2595
Dick Naber, (202) 447-9227
Program Studies: Jan Anderson, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Includes $90,000,000 for bilingual vocational training and $81,000,000 for bilingual desegregation programs.
2. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION SUPPORT SERVICES--LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS, STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.003)

Highlights

- The Office for Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs established Multifunctional Resource Centers (II.D).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-10, as amended by P.L. 95-561, Title VII of ESEA of 1965; 20 U.S.C. 3221-3261.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 232,000,000	$ 161,400,000
1980	299,000,000	171,763,000
1981	446,000,000 1/	161,427,000
1982	139,970,000 2/	138,058,000
1983	139,970,000 2/	138,057,000

Purpose: The Support Services Projects Program provides financial assistance to strengthen programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs.

Program Components: In FY 1983, support services activities included: State Education Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance; Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers, Materials Development Projects Program; and Bilingual Education Service Centers, the activities of which were consolidated into Multifunctional Resource Centers; and Research and Development Program.

1. State Educational Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance. The State Educational Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance provides Federal financial assistance to State educational agencies for projects designed to coordinate technical assistance provided by other agencies in support of programs of bilingual education funded in their States under Title VII.

2. Bilingual Education Service Centers (phased out)/Multifunctional Resource Centers. Bilingual Education Service Centers (BESCs) provided training and other technical services to programs of bilingual education and bilingual training programs within designated regional service centers. These centers, with the exception of one in Southern California, were phased out in 1983. More specific services were designed for the newly formed Multifunctional Resource Centers.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers (EDACs). These centers assist programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs within regional service areas in assessing, evaluating, and and disseminating bilingual education materials.

Program Components (Continued)

4. Materials Development Projects Program. This program awards grants and contracts to local school districts or institutions of higher education in conjunction with one or more school districts to develop instructional and testing materials for use in programs of bilingual education and bilingual education training programs.

5. Research and Development Program. This program authorizes:(a) research, development, and evaluation activities funded by the U.S. Department of Education to enhance the effectiveness of bilingual education and other programs for persons who have language proficiencies other than English; and (b) dissemination of information regarding teaching and learning, bilingualism, and limited English-proficient student achievement which is useful for programs of bilingual education.

a. Research, Development and Evaluation is supported under Part C of Title VII. Since 1979, research and evaluation activities have focused on three areas--assessment of national needs for bilingual education, improvement of the effectiveness of services to students and improvement in Title VII management and operation.

b. Dissemination of information related to bilingual education and services to children with limited English proficiency is the responsibility of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Newsletters and publications are widely disseminated to existing projects, State education agencies, and government decision-makers.

Eligibility:

1. State Educational Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance. Only State educational agencies are eligible for assistance.

2. Multifunctional Resource Centers. Those eligible include: (1) institutions of higher education (including junior colleges and community colleges and private nonprofit organizations) which apply, after consultation with, or jointly with, one or more local educational agencies or a State educational agency; (2) local educational agencies; and (3) State educational agencies.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centers. Those eligible for assistance are a local school district or an institution of higher education that applies jointly with one or more local school districts.

4. Materials Development Projects Program. A local school district or institution of higher education that applies jointly with one or more local school districts is eligible for assistance under the Materials Development Projects Program.

5. Research and Development Program. Awards under this program are made by grant and contract on a competitive basis.

Program Components (Continued)

Applicant Requirements: A grantee must employ bilingual personnel for the project to the extent possible. State Educational Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance must submit an assurance that they will comply with the "supplement not supplant" requirement.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: In the case of an application submitted by a local school district, the Secretary approves a project period of from one to three years. The duration of grants to applicants other than local school districts is determined by procedures and criteria in EDGAR. Funding will usually be for a 12-month period.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Audits are made of State and local organizations carrying out this program at least once every two years. Periodic audits should be made as part of recipients' systems of financial management and internal control to meet terms and conditions of grants and other agreements.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

1. State Educational Agency Projects for Coordinating Technical Assistance. Promote coordination and communication among State educational agencies (SEA) and between SEAs and Title VII service providers. Encourage increased SEA involvement in Title VII activities at the local level. Clarify regulations governing the program to eliminate misunderstandings regarding purpose of assistance and eligible activities.

2. Bilingual Education Service Centers. To package technical assistance strategies in preparation for phase-out and to continue providing requested technical assistance to local school districts.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers. To upgrade technical assistance activities to local school districts in the area of evaluation, based on the results of current Department findings, and to disseminate information on useful curriculum and instructional practices.

4. Materials Development Projects Program. Encourage development of instructional materials at the local level. Where assistance for materials development is requested, supplement grants for Basic and Demonstration Projects to provide for that activity.

5. Research and Development Program. To respond to Congressional mandates included in Part C of the 1978 Amendments to Title VII, ESEA.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Initial consolidation of services provided by BESCs, EDACs, and Materials Development Programs into 16 Multifunctional Resource Centers.

- In FY 1982, Part C funded six new research studies and continued twenty other contracts and grants. In FY 1983, twenty research and evaluation activities were funded. Three were continuations from FY 1982.

1. State Educational Agency Technical Assistance Projects

Program Scope: The legislation limits State educational agencies to an award amount that does not exceed 5 percent of the total amount awarded under Part A of the Bilingual Education Act to the local educational agencies within their respective States during the preceding fiscal year.

Forty-two projects with a total expenditure of $3,820,915 were served by this program in FY 1983.

Benefits Provided. State educational agencies coordinate technical assistance provided by other agencies in support of programs of bilingual education funded in their States under Title VII, ESEA. Examples of SEA coordination activities include--(1) coordination of assistance provided by other agencies to elementary and secondary schools within the State to improve the quality and adequacy of instruction and management of programs of bilingual education assisted under Title VII; and (2) coordination of the evaluation by other agencies of programs of bilingual education assisted under Title VII to determine their effectiveness.

2. Multifunctional Resource Centers

Program Scope: Ten million dollars in FY 1983 were targeted for sixteen centers. Fifteen (15) were funded to serve the entire country with the exception of Southern California which is being served through an extended grant for the Bilingual Education Service Center until a new contract can be let for a Multifunctional Resource Center.

Benefits Provided: Multifunctional Resource Centers: (1) design and implement a multidistrict, multiagency approach to provide support services for building the capacity of districts to improve instructional programs and other support services designed specifically for limited-English proficient students in sixteen service areas; (2) provide technical assistance to Title VII basic project grantees to improve project management, documentation, and evaluation; (3) coordinate with the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE), other support service centers and other federally funded centers or projects, to develop and implement a strategy or process for exchanging information and planning to improve the delivery and quality of support services provided by centers; and (4) coordinate with State educational agencies in their

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

plans for providing technical assistance to ensure that the Centers' plans complement the SEAs' plans for assisting, with State or Federal funds, the Title VII projects operating in the States.

3. Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers

Program Scope: There were three EDACs in FY 1983, funded at $1.87 million.

Benefits Provided: These centers evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of materials for use in programs of bilingual education or in bilingual education training programs; they publish and disseminate evaluation methods and materials; they assess the number of children in need of bilingual education, the number of and need for bilingual education teachers and personnel, and the need for curriculum materials and student assessment instruments; they develop instruments and procedures for use in needs assessment surveys; and they train State education agency personnel and others working with programs of bilingual education in the selection of appropriate evaluation and assessment methods and materials.

4. Materials Development Projects Program

Program Scope: Materials development was allocated $3.8 million in FY 1983.

Benefits Provided: Three major activities are authorized for materials development projects: (a) developing, testing, and disseminating instructional and testing materials for use in programs of bilingual education; (b) developing instructional materials for use by institutions of higher education in training persons who are participating in, or preparing to participate in, programs of bilingual education; and (c) conducting needs assessments to determine specific needs for materials development.

5. Research and Development Program

Program Scope: The Department awarded $5.24 million for research and evaluation studies and evaluations. Another $1.5 was budgeted to the National Clearinghouse on Bilingual Education.

Benefits Provided: Part C research results are beginning to provide information for policy and management. Since 1979, sixty studies have been supported, including basic research, applied research, development, and evaluation. A major focus of these documents is on research findings of studies funded by the Part C research funds. The Clearinghouse also provides specific information on request. A toll-free number expedites these requests. The National Clearinghouse is currently operated by InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc., with joint funding from Title VII and the National Institute of Education.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The five support services programs are being affected by proposed legislative, budget, and administrative changes:

- The proposed Bilingual Education Improvements Act of 1983 will strengthen the role of State educational agencies in assisting OBEMLA to monitor bilingual education programs and provide technical assistance to them.
- Budgetary and administrative changes are consolidating the functions of the Materials Development Projects Program, the Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Centers, and the Bilingual Education Service Centers into one entity in FY 1983, the Multifunctional Resource Centers.

The proposed amendments and changes reflect Administration philosophy that the appropriate Federal role in education is to strengthen State and local discretion in decision making. They also reflect the changing needs and resources of local districts and States. The changes will improve the current law while maintaining its basic goals and structure.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Supplementary Budget Sheet

	1983 Actual
Support Services	$ 16,557,000
SEA technical assistance	$ 3,970,000
Number of projects	42
Studies and evaluations	$ 5,280,000
Clearinghouse	1,500,000
Advisory council	117,000
Materials development and dissemination	5,690,000
Number of materials development grants	10
Summary Basic Projects	62
Number of EDACs	3
Multifunctional Resource Centers	$ 10,000,000
Number of projects	15

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

In FY 1983 Part C research activites began:

- An evaluation of the management and information dissemination activities of the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education by Pelavin Associates, Washington, D.C.
- A study of Title VII funded State education agency coordination of technical assistance activities to examine the technical assistance capabilities available to local school districts and the types of technical assistance which State educational agencies are delivering, by SRA Technology, Mountain View, California.
- Numerous basic research grants were awarded to study the English language acquisition characteristics of Vietnamese students (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.); the instructional strategies which some LEA's are using to assist LEP students to make the transition to all-English classrooms (Linda Ventriglia, Boston, Massachusetts); and the causal relationship between the development of bilingualism, cognitive flexibility, and social-cognitive skills in Hispanic children (K. Hakuta, Yale University). A contract was also awarded to develop research questions relevant to Title VII on the basis of current research and the proposed amendments to Title VII (Decision Resources, Washington, D.C.).

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations:	Rudy Munis	(202) 245-2695
Program Studies:	Jan Anderson	(202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Includes $90,000,000 for bilingual vocational training and $81,000,000 for bilingual desegregation programs.
2. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

AID TO STATES FOR EDUCATION OF HANDICAPPED IN STATE OPERATED AND STATE SUPPORTED SCHOOLS (CFDA No. 84.009)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-313, ESEA Title I, Sections 146-147 as amended by P.L. 93-380, P.L. 95-561 and as consolidated by P.L. 97-35, ECIA Chapter 1, Section 554(a) (2)(B). (Expires September 30, 1987)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	143,353,492	143,353,492
1980	150,000,000	145,000,000
1981	165,000,000	156,625,000
1982	171,092,000	146,520,000
1983	146,520,000	146,520,000

Purpose: To provide Federal assistance to State Agencies which are directly responsible for providing free public education to handicapped children.

Restrictions on use of funds: State agencies are authorized to use these funds only for programs and projects that are designed to meet the special education and related service needs of handicapped children. Handicap categories include mental retardation, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, deaf-blind, specific learning disabilities, multi-handicapped, and other health impairments requiring special education.

Formula: Each State's share is determined by a statutory formula. This formula is based upon the number of eligible handicapped children counted in average daily attendance (ADA), multiplied by 40 percent of the State per-pupil expenditure (but no less than 80 percent or more than 120 percent of the national per-pupil expenditure). The amount is ratably reduced based on the appropriation available for distribution.

Eligible Children: Children in State-operated or State-supported programs, plus handicapped children in local education agencies (LEAs) where the following conditions are met:

- The child must have been reported previously in the ADA of a State agency.
- The child must be currently enrolled in an appropriately designed special educational program in the LEA.
- The LEA must receive from the State agency an amount equal to what the State agency receives from the Federal Government for the children.

Administration: This is a State-administered program. Applications for project funds are submitted by participating institutions/schools to their supervising State agency. Those applications approved by a State agency are forwarded to the State education agency (SEA) for final approval and release of funds. All participating institutions/schools must submit end-of-year reports to their State agencies accounting for the expenditure of funds and providing an evaluation of project activities.

RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was to continue financial assistance to States to assist them in providing services to eligible handicapped children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

The children served through the program tend to be more severely handicapped than children supported under Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act. Under this program the State can obtain a higher Federal contribution per child than under the Part B program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Services: Funding in FY 1983 provided services for about 246,000 children in programs administered by 135 State agencies.

Expenditures: The average Federal per-pupil contribution was $596 per year.

Children Served: Children benefitting under the program in 1983 are distributed across the following handicap categories: Mentally Retarded - 102,779; Deaf-Blind - 1,170; Orthopedically Impaired - 11,047; Other Health Impaired - 3,992; Visually Handicapped 9,798; Speech Impaired 14,021; Specific Learning Disabled 22,112; Hard of Hearing 4,044; Deaf 22,184; Emotionally Disturbed 39,555; and Multihandicapped 15,112 (see E.1 below).

State Administration: Procedures in State education agencies have changed to place more importance on the total special education program, and ensure systematic monitoring of providers for compliance with State and Federal requirements. This includes procedures for ensuring fulfillment of the P.L. 93-380 local education agency transfer provisions. Fiscal accountability is maintained in most States by more than one State agency with at least one being the State education agency. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis:

1. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services program data.
2. Assessment of Educational Programs in State Supported and State Operated Schools; Rehab Group, Inc., Falls Church, Virginia, September 1979.

F. Other Supporting Data: None.

III. Response to GEPA 417 (b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for further information

Program Operations: Slagle Allbritton, (202) 245-0085
Program Studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8877

HANDICAPPED SCHOOL PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.027)

Highlights

- The number of handicapped children served under this program continued to rise in FY 1983. A large part of this increase was due to the growing numbers of students identified as learning disabled (II.C).

- A five-year longitudinal evaluation of the State grant program was completed. The study tracked the implementation of P.L. 94-142 in 22 school districts in nine States. It found progress in implementing major requirements of the law, although some problems have persisted (II.C).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B; 20 U.S.C. Section 1401, 1411 et. seq. (1976 and Supp. V). P.L. 91-230 as amended (expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979..................	1/	$ 804,000,000
1980..................	1/	874,500,000
1981..................	1/	874,500,000
1982..................	969,850,000 2/	931,008,000
1983..................	$1,017,900,000 2/	$1,017,900,000

Purpose: The purpose of the Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, (EHA-B), is to assist States in assuring that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education. Under the EHA-B, grants are awarded to States to help pay for part of the cost incurred by State and local educational agencies in providing special education and related services to handicapped children, aged 3 to 21.3/ These grants assist States in complying with the EHA-B's requirement that all eligible handicapped children receive the special education and related services needed to provide them with a free appropriate public education. These services must be provided in the least restrictive environment and in accordance with an Individualized Education Program which sets out the child's unique educational needs. The Act also establishes safeguards so beneficiaries can challenge the manner in which school districts provide a free appropriate public education.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, children having specific learning disabilities, deaf-blind children, or multihandicapped children who require special education and related services are eligible.

Program Profile (Continued)

Applicant Eligibility: State education agencies in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may apply to the Department of Education for participation in the Part B, EHA program under Sections 611 and 619. The Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs is eligible for a grant under Section 611. Once States begin participating, local education agencies may apply to their State education agency for funds.

Application Procedure: States must submit a three-year program plan which (1) meets the conditions in Section 612 and Section 613 of Part B of the EHA, Public Law 94-142 and (2) describes the purpose and activities for which funds under this Act will be expended during each of the three fiscal years covered by the plan. Local education agencies submit applications to their State education agency for approval.

Award Procedure: Once the program plan is submitted and fully approved, a grant award document representing the total grant amount for that fiscal year, or portion thereof, if under a continuing resolution, is forwarded to the State department of education. During the three-year cycle, amendments may be required in order to maintain a fully approved plan.

Pre- and Post-Application Requirements

Preapplication Coordination: All public and private institutions and other organizations interested in personnel preparation should be given an opportunity to participate fully in the development, review, and annual updating of the comprehensive system of personnel development. Representatives of private schools must be consulted during all phases of the development of the project. Children in private elementary and secondary schools must have an opportunity to participate in the program assisted or carried out under this grant to the extent consistent with their number and location in the State. Public hearings must be held in order to provide general comment on the annual program plan.

Reports: Annual financial and performance reports are submitted to the Department of Education from the State Department of Education.

Formula and Matching Requirements: Funds for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, are allotted on the basis of a certified count of the number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services on December 1 of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is made. Funds to the outlying areas and the Bureau of Indian Affairs are allotted on the basis of their respective need not to exceed 1 percentum of the aggregated amounts available to States in a fiscal year, as determined by the Secretary of Education.

Pre- and Post-Application Requirements (Continued)

There are non-supplanting and excess cost requirements. State EHA-B funds available to the State for direct and support services must be matched on a program basis. The statistical factors used for fund allocation are: (1) the total number of handicapped children receiving special education 3 through 21 years old) by State and (2) the average national per pupil expenditure by State. Statistical factors used for eligibility do not apply to this program. This program has maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements. At least 75 percent of the funds appropriated must be passed through by the State education agency to the local education agencies. Up to 25 percent of the funds may be retained at the State level for support services and administration; however, of the total funds received direct and by the State not more than 5 percent or $300,000 (whichever is greater) may be used for administrative expenses.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: As a formula grant program with detailed legal requirements the continuing goals of the program are to enforce compliance with the provisions of the law. In particular, objectives are:

- To ensure that all handicapped children have available to them a free, appropriate public education which includes special education and related services designed to meet their unique needs.
- To ensure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected.
- To assist States and localities in providing for the education of all handicapped children.
- To assess and ensure the effectiveness of efforts to educate those children.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program's accomplishments are detailed in its annual reports to Congress. Briefly:

- The number of handicapped children receiving special education and related services continued to rise (see Section C).
- States continue to report increases in the number of preschool-age handicapped children served. Since 1976-77 there has been an increase of more than 23 percent in the number of preschool children served.

RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

- Just as there have been increases in the child count, there have also been increases in the number of personnel responsible for serving handicapped children. For special education teachers and related services personnel, the number increased from 435,584 in school year 1979-80 to 440,109 in school year 1980-81 and 446,695 in 1981-1982. 3/

- Noticeable expansion of services to secondary and postsecondary-age handicapped students has occurred. The number of children served in 1982-83 represents a 70 percent increase over the number served in 1978-79.

- Fewer than 7 percent of all handicapped children are educated in either separate schools or separate environments; of the 93 percent who are educated in regular schools about two-thirds receive their education in the regular classroom with nonhandicapped peers.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Since the implementation of the Education For All Handicapped Children Act, the number of children served under P.L. 94-142 has continued to grow from 3,485,000 in 1976-77 to an estimated 4,052,595 in 1982-83. There have been some notable changes in the number of children of certain handicapping conditions receiving special education and related services since the first child count was taken in 1976-77. The most dramatic change has been for the learning disabled category. In 1982-83, 1,723,759 children aged 3-21 were counted as learning disabled under Public Law 94-142, an increase of 119 percent since 1976-77. Counts of children in other handicapping conditions have declined. For example, for the mentally retarded, all but seven States reported a decline in child count from 1980-81 to 1981-82. (For more detail, see annual reports to Congress).

The children served were in the following categories in school year 1982-83:

Handicapping Condition	Percentage of Population, Aged 5-17	Number of Children, Aged 3-21
Learning Disabled	4.27	1,723,759
Speech Impaired	2.78	1,120,176
Mentally Retarded	1.68	678,054
Emotionally Disturbed	.78	313,876
Other Health Impaired	.12	48,104
Multi-handicapped	.12	46,459
Hard of Hearing and Deaf	.12	50,367
Orthopedically Impaired	.12	49,119
Visually Handicapped	.05	21,298
Deaf-Blind	.00	1,383
TOTAL	10.04	4,052,595

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

The share per child has also continued to grow from $72 in 1977 to $251 in 1983. The following table summarizes these trends:

Fiscal Year	Child Count	Funding	Share Per Child
1977...........	3,485,000	$ 251,769,927	$ 72
1978...........	3,561,000	566,030,074	159
1979...........	3,700,000	804,000,000	217
1980...........	3,803,000	874,500,000	230
1981...........	3,941,000	874,500,000	222
1982...........	3,990,000	931,008,000	233
1983...........	4,053,000	1,017,900,000	251

The Federal government provides only a small proportion, about 8 percent, of the excess cost of providing services to handicapped children. In November 1981, the Department of Education published the results of a major study estimating the cost of special education (Kakalik et al., 1981). Data from that study collected in 1977-78 estimated that the nationwide expenditures for the "added cost" of special education were over $7 billion. The total cost of special education and related services per handicapped child served in 1977-78 was $3,577, 2.17 times greater than the cost of regular education per nonhandicapped child. The added cost of special education and related services above the cost of regular education was an estimated $1,927 per handicapped child served. Figures from the Education Department's budget indicate that this excess cost will be about $3,100 in FY 1984. Of course, there are great differences in excess cost depending on the child's age, handicapping condition, type of placement, etc. For example, in 1977-78 the excess cost for providing special education and related services to a handicapped child ranged from $603 for a speech impaired child to $8,014 for a functionally blind child (Kakalik, et al., 1981).

Over the past several years a number of studies have been conducted of the implementation of this program. At the time that P.L. 94-142 was passed the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped undertook a series of planning and evaluation studies aimed at monitoring progress in implementing the act and documenting problems in its implementation.

The most comprehensive of the studies undertaken was the Longitudinal Study of the Impact of P.L. 94-142 on a select number of local educational agencies (SRI, 1982). The fifth and final report of that study was completed during FY 1983. This study indicates that since the law went into effect, progress has been made in implementing its requirements. While LEAs were first concerned with coming into procedural compliance, attention later focused on expanding the scope and comprehensiveness of special education programs and related services. The State grant program has also increased parents' awareness of their rights under P.L. 94-142. The report also

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

documents examples of some of the negative effects of the law, such as increased administrative time, paperwork requirements, and problems determining the reasonable limits of LEA responsibility to provide services to handicapped children.

Another study which was completed in FY 1983 was a national survey which examined LEA procedures for referring, assessing, and placing students (AMS, 1983). The aim of the study was to determine which procedures were in place to prevent the erroneous classification of children, particularly on the basis of race or culture. The study found that referral rates for minority children for assistance of any kind were roughly in proportion to their incidence in the school-aged population. While diagnosticians were more likely to judge minority children as "probably mentally retarded," they were not placed in these programs in larger percentages.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

General program goals for FY 1984 remain the same as those outlined above. Congressional proposals for reauthorizing this program may modify authorization levels, but leave the basic provisions of the program intact.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Applied Management Sciences, A Study to Evaluate Procedures Undertaken to Prevent Erroneous Classification of Handicapped Children, Washington, D.C., May 1983.

2. U.S. Department of Education, Fifth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of P.L. 94-142, 1983 and Sixth Annual Report, 1984. (Also, previous annual reports.)

3. Wright, A.R. et al. Local Implementation of P.L. 94-142: Final Report of a Longitudinal Study, SRI International, Menlo Park, California, December 1982.

4. Kakalik, J.S. et al. The Cost of Special Education, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, November 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Not available.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No major new studies have been undertaken during the past year. Small analyses are in progress focusing on State and local expenditures for special education, and eligibility criteria for specific handicapping conditions. These analyses are part of a contract with Decision Resources in Washington, D.C.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses (Continued)

Further Information Contacts

Program Operations: Slagle Albritton, (202) 245-0085
Program Studies: Beatrice F. Birman, (202) 245-7997

Notes

1. Authorization: Number of handicapped children aged 3-21 multiplied by 5 percent of APPE (FY 1977), 10 percent of APPE (FY 1978), 20 percent of APPE (1979), 30 percent of APPE (1980), and 40 percent of APPE (1981).

2. This authorization is established by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981.

3. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

4. Changes in reporting requirements probably result in a slight underestimate of personnel in 1981-1982. (See Sixth Annual Report to Congress).

STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR PRESCHOOL SERVICES TO HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (CFDA No. 84.027)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE[1/]

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, P.L. 91-230 as amended, 1419. (Expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	2/	$17,500,000
1980	2/	25,000,000
1981	2/	25,000,000
1982	$25,000,000	24,000,000
1983	25,000,000	25,000,000

Purpose: To stimulate State and local education agencies to expand educational services to handicapped preschool children, ages 3 through 5, thereby increasing their opportunities to benefit from early educational intervention.

Eligibility: State education agencies in the 50 States, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Virgin Islands, and Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may also apply to the Department of Education for participation in the Part B, program under Section 619. Once States begin participating, local education agencies may apply to their State educational agency for funds if the State provides local funding. To establish eligibility, States must:

- Make application to the Secretary of Education.
- Have in effect a policy that assures all handicapped children a free appropriate public education.
- Have on file in the Department of Education an approved State plan to provide such services.
- Already be providing services to some preschool handicapped children aged 3-5.

Distribution of Funds: Grants to States are based on the actual number of handicapped preschool children ages 3-5 being served. SEA's must report to the Secretary the number of handicapped children residing in the State who were receiving special education and related services on December 1 of that school year. State educational agencies may distribute funds received under this program to local educational agencies on a discretionary basis.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded each fiscal year (a 15 month period from July 1 to September 30), with a one-year carryover provision.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual financial and performance reports are submitted to the Department of Education from the State Department of Education. State education agencies are responsive for auditing expenditures of local educational agencies.

Relationship to Early Childhood Education Program: As a complement to the Incentive Grant program which aims at supporting basic educational and related services, the Early Childhood Education program authorized by Part C, Section 623, of the Education of the Handicapped Act supports demonstration projects which focus on improving the quality of educational programs for young handicapped children. The incentive grant program distributes funds on a formula basis, whereas the Early Childhood projects are funded through the discretionary grant process.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department identified no specific objective for this program other than to fulfill its purpose to encourage States to expand educational programs to handicapped preschool children aged 3 through 5.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Not applicable. (This section is reserved for reporting progress and accomplishments with respect to specific operating goals in effect during FY 1983.)

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In FY 1983, about $103 per child was provided for the 242,000 children served.

Program Scope: Fifty-five grants were made under this program in FY 1983. Grants were made to 49 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Trust Territories and American Samoa.

Program Effectiveness: The number of handicapped children, ages 3 through 5, served by this program has increased from 197,000 in 1977 to 242,000 in 1983. It is estimated that this program serves 1.9 percent of the total population of children aged 3 through 5 and only about half of all handicapped preschool children in need of services. A significant proportion (more than half) of handicapped preschool children aged 3 through 5 are currently unserved because only 20 States have mandates to provide services to handicapped preschool aged children. Those States that are seriously committed to serving 3 to 5 year old handicapped children are providing services to 4.5 percent of the total State population of children aged 3 through 5. Thus, it is estimated that if all States provided services to handicapped preschool children, the current number being served (1.9 percent) would double. Children do not necessarily receive services from this program. The program distributes funds based on the number of children served by States.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

None.

F. Other Supporting Data

Children Served, Funding, and Average Costs for the Preschool Program:

Fiscal Year	Child Count	Funding	Share Per Child
1977	197,000	$12,500,000	$ 64
1978	201,000	15,000,000	75
1979	215,000	17,500,000	81
1980	232,000	25,000,000	108
1981	237,000	25,000,000	105
1982	228,000	24,000,000	105
1983	242,000	25,000,000	110

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations and Studies: Bill Wolfe
(202) 245-9661

Notes

1. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

2. The authorization level for the program was determined by an entitlement formula; each State received $300 (ratably reduced according to the proportion of funds actually allocated by Congress) for every handicapped child, age 3 through 5, who is receiving special education and related services.

HANDICAPPED REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS
(CFDA 84.028)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 621, Public Law 91-230, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 19,000,000	$ 9,750,000
1980	21,000,000	9,750,000
1981	24,000,000	7,656,000
1982	9,800,000	2,880,000
1983	9,800,000	4,130,000

Purpose: To establish regional resource centers (RRCs) which provide advice and technical services to educators for improving the education of handicapped children.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, State education agencies, or combinations of such institutions and agencies (including local education agencies) within particular regions of the United States.

Applicant Requirements: None.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Contracts are approved for a period of 36 months and are renewable annually upon evidence of satisfactory development and performance. During FY 83, the number of centers was cut back to six.

Obligations of Recipients: Quarterly progress reports and other specified reports and products.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department changed the primary direction of the program from providing services to providing technical assistance. Principal objectives are:

- Identifying problems and program assistance needs and developing a regional program assistance needs report.
- Developing program assistance agreements between RRCs and SEAs.
- Providing program assistance to SEAs.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- o Establishing RRC advisory committees.
- o Evaluating and developing educational programs for handicapped children.
- o Developing special issues.
- o Coordinating RRC program activities.
- o Cooperating in multi-regional program assistance activities.
- o Evaluating and reporting RRC assistance.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o In prior years about 90,000 handicapped children have been appraised and referred for appropriate educational services.
- o The Regional Resource Centers now provide technical assistance to states in identifying persistent problems in serving handicapped children such as non-discriminatory assessment, parental involvement, and interagency cooperation.
- o Focus of program is now on providing technical assistance to states.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: FY'83 program funds ($4,130,000) support six Regional Resource Centers. Current emphasis with reduced funding is now to provide technical assistance to States. Prior to 1983, approximately 5,000 persons were trained in the best available procedures for carrying out the mandate to provide a free appropriate education for every handicapped child.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No changes to the legislation are being recommended.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Through more than 600 program assistance activities with State and local agencies, 20,000 teachers, parents, and administrators received assistance from the centers in FY 1981. More than 250 successful practices have been identified and shared with other clients.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Slagle Allbritton, (202) 245-0085

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

HANDICAPPED INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS--DEAF BLIND CENTERS
(CFDA No. 84.025)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Sections 622 and 624, Public Law 91-230, as amended. 20 USC 1422 and 1424. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 24,000,000	$ 16,000,000
1980	26,000,000	16,000,000
1981	29,000,000	16,000,000
1982	16,000,000	15,360,000
1983	16,000,000	15,360,000

Purpose: To establish a limited number of centers to assure the provision of the following services to all deaf-blind children: (1) comprehensive diagnostic and evaluative services; (2) a program for their education, adjustment, and orientation, which includes prevocational and vocational training and (3) effective consultative services for their parents, teachers, and others involved in their welfare.

Eligibility: Public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions.

Applicant Requirements: A grant shall be made only if the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services determines that there is satisfactory assurance that the center will provide such services as stated in Public Law 91-230, Part C, Section 622 (d) (1) (A, B, C,) and (2), Education of the Handicapped Act.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: In FY 83, funding was on a one-year basis.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Progress reports shall be made on a monthly basis, with final reports submitted at the end of the budget period.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were:

- To ensure that the States will have the necessary capacity to serve the deaf-blind children for whom they are responsible, including the provision of training to personnel in participating agencies which are engaged

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

in, or responsible for, direct delivery of services to deaf-blind children or their families; and dissemination of materials and information about effective methods, approaches, or techniques for the adjustment and education of deaf-blind children.

- To ensure the provision of services authorized by P. L. 91-230, as amended, to those deaf-blind children from birth through 21 years of age, in each State served by the center, to whom the State is not obligated to make available a free appropriate public education under Part B of the EHA. See Section 612(2)(B) of the EHA, 20 U.S.C. 1412(2)(B). In the provision of these services, special emphasis shall be paid (a) to expanding the availability of cost-effective, remedial interventions with deaf-blind infants and young children which are designed to meet their unique learning needs as identified through on-going diagnostic services; and (b) to facilitating the effective transition of deaf-blind children from educational settings to normal home, community, and work environments.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Continued technical assistance is provided for the development and demonstration of pre-school programs and programs for facilitating the transition of deaf-blind youth from educational to other social service programs.

- FY 82 funds supported 7 single state and 8 multistate centers which sub-contracted with approximately 200 state, local, and private organizations, which in turn carried out the following types of activities:

  (1) Full and part-time educational services including prevocational/vocational training programs.

  (2) Medical diagnosis and educational evaluation.

  (3) Family counseling.

  (4) Inservice personnel training.

  (5) Alternative service programs: satellite homes, community residence programs, respite care.

  (6) Dissemination of information on methodologies, materials, curriculum, and proceedings of workshop and training services.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Children Served: In FY 1983 about 5,155 deaf-blind children were identified.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

No legislative revisions are recommended.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in C Above:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Paul Thompson, (202) 472-7993

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.024)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Sections 623 and 624, P.L. 91-230 as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1423 and 1424. (Expires September 30, 1986).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 25,000,000	$22,000,000
1980	25,000,000	20,000,000
1981	20,000,000	17,500,000
1982	20,000,000	16,800,000
1983	20,000,000	16,800,000

Purpose: To support the development, demonstration and dissemination of experimental educational practices which meet the needs of preschool handicapped children.

Eligibility: Eligible applicants for contracts and grants are public agencies and private non-profit organizations.

Applicant Requirements for Grants: Coordination with public schools is required and encouraged with State Departments of Education. Projects may serve children from birth through eight years of age, but services for children below age six are emphasized. (Requirements for contracts are provided in contract procurement documents.)

Types of Projects Supported: Five types of projects are supported under this program.

- Demonstration Projects (grants). These are to develop service models based on current outstanding practices.
- Outreach Projects (grants). These projects disseminate model programs and facilitate their adoption and implementation in new sites.
- State Implementation Projects (grants). These projects provide assistance to State Education Agencies in developing plans to provide services to preschool handicapped children.
- Special Projects (contracts). These projects provide supportive services to other program components.
- Research Institutes (contracts). These projects conduct long-term research into the problems of young children.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants and contracts are awarded annually on the basis of a national competition. Each model demonstration project is approved for a three-year period, but receives second- and third-year funding on the basis of successful performance and availability of funds; each outreach project is approved for a one-year period, but can receive second and third-year funding on the basis of successful performance and availability of funds; and each state implementation grant is generally approved for a two-year period, but receives second-year funding on the basis of successful performance and availability of funds.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Recipients are required to contribute at least 10 percent of the cost of carrying out projects funded under this program, either in cash or in kind. Parents cannot be charged for services provided under this program. Progress reports and final reports are required. (Obligations of contract recipients are detailed in individual contracts.)

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

For FY 1983, some specific objectives for particular program components are as follows:

o Demonstration Projects

- to emphasize projects which demonstrate local/State/regional coordination among agencies;
- to emphasize programs for children from birth to 3 years of age; and
- to emphasize new models over continuations.

o Outreach Projects

- to support new outreach projects (as opposed to continuations) to assure that new models are represented; and
- to encourage maximum dissemination and replication, e.g., encouraging grantees to get approval from the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).

o State Implementation Projects

- to encourage interagency coordination and involvement in State planning.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In FY 1983 this program funded the following projects [1/]:

Type of Project	New	Continuing	Total
Demonstration	45	30	75
Outreach	52	0	52
State Implementation	25	0	25
Special Projects	3	1	4
Research Institutions	0	3	3
TOTAL	125	34	159

Specific characteristics of those funded under particular categories are as follows:

- Demonstration Projects
  - 43 percent provide services for children from birth through age 3
  - 36 percent provide services for children from birth through age 8
  - 12 percent provide services for children from 3 through 8 years of age
  - 36 projects represent joint efforts by universities, LEAs, SEAs, state agencies, and hospitals.
- Outreach Projects
  - All projects are new this year
  - Twenty-seven percent of the funded projects have received JDRP approval.
- State Implementation Projects
  - FY 1983 projects demonstrated more instances of joint working relationships among State agencies and better use of existing resources.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness: A study of the impact of the Handicapped Childhood Early Education Program (HCEEP) was completed in 1982 (See E.1 below). Surveys and site visitation provided data on 280 projects which completed a three-year period of demonstration prior to 1981. Children served by HCEEP projects made dramatic adjustments in regular classrooms. HCEEP projects also served as catalysts for generating additional resources through project adoptions in new sites and continuation of projects after federal funding. Specific findings are reported below.

Product/Project Adoptions and Dissemination

- Twenty-two HCEEP projects have been approved for dissemination by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel of the Department of Education on the basis of evidence of effective programming and cost of replication.
- The study identified 2,157 replications: 1,991 as a result of outreach activities and 166 from projects in the demonstration phase.
- More than 3,000 products have been developed by HCEEP projects and extensively disseminated to personnel of other agencies, many through commercial publishers.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Project Continuations

- Eighty percent (80%) of the 280 projects were still continuing to serve children independent of HCEEP funding.

- More than 30,200 children have been served in continuation projects at no cost to the HCEEP.

Extent of Services/Cost Savings

- Replication programs stemming from the work of the HCEEP projects, but not funded by this program, served 107,850 children.

- For each child served directly in the demonstration projects, 6.4 children received services through continuation of demonstration projects and through replication of projects.

- For each demonstration project, an average of 33 children per year were served with other funds.

- Projects have been active in every State, in several territories, and in urban and rural areas as specified by the legislation.

- For every Federal dollar expended in programming, $18.37 has been generated in programming for handicapped children and their families.

Treatment Gains

- Fifty-five percent (55%) of the children who leave HCEEP demonstration projects are placed in integrated settings with non-handicapped children, which is less expensive than more specialized placements.

- Sixty-seven percent (67%) of the children who leave HCEEP demonstration projects perform in the average and above-average range in relation to their peers, according to staff of the regular and special education programs to which they graduate.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. "An Analysis of the Impact of the Handicapped Children's Early Education Program - Final Report." Prepared for Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education under Contract Number 300-81-0661. Roy Littlejohn Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C.; November, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations and studies:	Slagle Allbritton (202) 245-0085

Notes

1. Research Institutions were continued in 1983, but they were fully funded through 1986 with 1982 money.

INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS FOR SEVERELY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(CFDA No. 84.086)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 624; Public Law 91-230, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 1/	$ 5,000,000
1980	1/	5,000,000
1981	1/	4,375,000
1982	5,000,000	2,880,000
1983	5,000,000	2,880,000

Purpose: To improve and expand innovative educational/training services for severely handicapped children and youth and improve the acceptance of such people by the general public, professionals, and possible employers.

Eligibility and Awards: Public and nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, including State departments of special education, intermediate or local educational agencies, institutions of higher learning, professional organizations and volunteer associations. Competitions are held annually for new awards or continuations for up to three years (total). Outside readers judged the FY 83 applicants in terms of their perceived ability to enhance effectiveness, the degree to which they complemented basic functions, their plan of operation, key personnel, budget and cost effectiveness, evaluation plan, and adequacy of resources.

Contractor and Grantee Activities: Develop or refine instrumentation for the identification and diagnosis of severely handicapped children and youth; develop or refine curriculum or techniques for serving those children; and package and disseminate products of model projects.

Contractor and Grantee Requirements: Coordination of activities with other agencies serving the same population, periodic progress reports as required by the specific Statements of Work, cost and other project documentation for post-project audits.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- o implement the Secretary's Initiative emphasizing the transition of handicapped youngsters to the least restrictive environments for services, with special attention on the severely handicapped.
- o support programs emphasizing parent involvement.
- o solicit non-directed demonstration projects of innovative services for the severely handicapped.
- o direct funds for services to children not served by other programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o Funded model demonstration projects for integration of severely handicapped children into settings with less and non-handicapped persons; for deinstitutionalization; for improvement of daily living skills; and for development of vocational training in technological skill areas.
- o Provided guidance and other services to 2,100 parents of severely handicapped children.
- o Made awards to develop innovative techniques for early identification of children at risk of needing special education services due to the severity of their handicapping condition.
- o Awarded contracts to eight States for "designs for system change," strategies intended to improve the delivery of comprehensive educational services to all severely handicapped children throughout the State.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Approximately 5000 youngsters are served in demonstration projects.

Effectiveness: There are no systematic effectiveness data about these projects.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None

E. Supporting Study and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

None

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Paul Thompson, (202) 472-7993

Program Studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. No funds were authorized separately for this program. Funding was provided based on the amounts authorized for other Part C activities related to Section 624 activities.
2. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

REGIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR DEAF AND OTHER HANDICAPPED PERSONS
(CFDA No. 84.078)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part C, Section 625, Public Law 91-230, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 12,000,000	$ 2,400,000
1980	14,000,000	2,400,000
1981	16,000,000	2,950,000
1982	4,000,000	2,832,000
1983	4,000,000	2,832,000

Purpose: To develop and operate specially designed or modified programs of vocational, technical, postsecondary, or adult education for deaf or other handicapped persons.

Eligibility and Awards: Institutions of higher education, including junior and community colleges, vocational and technical institutions, and other appropriate nonprofit educational agencies. Grants and contracts are awarded annually for one-year efforts, with continuations possible for additional years. Priority is given to programs serving multistate or interstate regions or large population centers; programs adapting existing programs of vocational-technical, postsecondary, or adult education to the special needs of handicapped persons; and programs designed to serve areas where a need for such services is clearly demonstrated.

Grantee or Contractor Activities: Funds support two types of activities: direct services (supported by grants to postsecondary or vocational institutions) to deaf students and demonstration projects (under grants and contract) to develop innovative models for services to postsecondary and adult handicapped students.

Grantee/Contractor Requirements: Progress and final reports, audit documents.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objective with respect to this program was as follows:

- solicit grant applications from a large range of institutions, including some new to this effort.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

° In response to the Federal Register notice, the Department received twenty-one applications, seventeen of which were from organizations new to this program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Scope: In 1983, four grants were awarded institutions serving deaf students. Program staff estimate that approximately 600 students are served by interpreters, note-takers, or other assisters. The grants range from $400,000 to $600,000 on an annual basis. Seven demonstration grants were continued at an average award of $55,000.

In 1983, no new contracts were awarded.

Effectiveness: No data on effectiveness are available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

None

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Joe Rosenstein, (202) 472-4660

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED
(CFDA No. 84.029)

Highlights:

- o New program regulations became effective on July 20, 1983. (II.B)
- o New award priorities were established for project grants. (II.B)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Sections 631, 632, and 634, P.L. 91-230, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 80,000,000	57,687,000
1980	85,000,000	55,375,000
1981	90,000,000	43,500,000
1982	58,000,000	49,300,000
1983	58,000,000	49,300,000

Purpose: To provide fully trained and certified special education teachers including early childhood specialists, administrators and supervisors, speech-language pathologists, audiologists, physical educators and vocational educators; train doctoral and postdoctoral teacher trainers, researchers, and administrators; train paraprofessionals, career educators, recreation specialists, health services personnel, school psychologists, social service providers, physical therapists and occupational therapists; train State educational agency personnel and their constituencies; develop innovative instructional models for use by providers of preservice and inservice training; train deans and local educational agency officials so that they can train regular classroom teachers; and train trainers of volunteers including parents. 1/

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, and other nonprofit public and private agencies.

Uses of Project Funds: Grants may be used for undergraduate and graduate, traineeships, and special projects. Funds may be obligated for student stipends, dependency allowances, or institutional support.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Stipends may go to students who are preparing for, or are engaged in work with handicapped children as a teacher, supervisor, administrator or researcher. Stipends may also be paid to students enrolled in inservice programs funded under this authority, although program emphasis is increasingly on preservice training.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded for twelve-month periods. Multi-year grants for periods of two to three years are often approved with continuation subject to availability of funds and submission of satisfactory annual applications.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are due once a year, and project records must be maintained for five years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Issue new regulations designed to (1) establish seven separate funding priorities and (2) simplify financial assistance requirements.
- Establish new funding priorities to allow the Secretary to determine which of the priorities will be addressed and specify preservice or inservice activities in relation to those priorities.
- Improve the quality of special education teacher-training programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Seven funding priorities were incorporated in the regulations and identified as follows: (1) special educators, (2) leadership personnel, (3) related services, (4) trainers of regular educators, (5) trainers of parents and volunteers, (6) SEA programming, and (7) special projects. The regulations were also modified to allow the grantee agency's own policy to determine the amount of assistance per trainee.
- Grant funds were assigned among the seven priority areas with emphasis on preservice training in each of the areas. For the 358 new projects funded in FY 1983, 85 percent (or 305) of the awards addressed the priority areas of preservice training for special educators, related services personnel, leadership personnel, and parents/volunteers trainers. Objectives related to the remaining program priorities were also met. (II.C)
- The program has identified the best practices in training projects through the review of the professional literature, and a publication is in progress. The program has also developed an automated data base to facilitate the sharing of quality practices.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Approximately 821 projects are currently supported, which represent training efforts in each State and territory. In Fiscal Year 1983, 358 new projects and 463 continuation projects were funded.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Appropriateness of Funding Priorities: FY 1983 represented a transitional year as emphasis shifted from inservice training to preservice training. A cross-year comparison showed that in FY 1982 preservice projects were awarded 58 percent of the total available funds leaving 42 percent of the funds for the support of inservice activities. This contrasts with the FY 1983 funding mix of 87.3 percent of new project funds for preservice projects and 12.7 percent of such funds for inservice ones. Moreover, the FY 1983 inservice projects were directed toward providing short-term training to special education personnel rather than toward the previous emphasis on training regular classroom teachers.

This shift in program emphasis was caused by two factors. Information included in States' annual plans required under the Education of the Handicapped Act indicated that in order for the educational system to meet its full service commitment, an additional 29,000 new special educators were needed for the 1983-84 school year.(E.1) Second, a study by Applied Management Sciences (E.2) defined the national need for inservice training of regular classroom teachers as so massive that the program's resources were inadequate to the task. It therefore suggested that the program's funds could be more effectively used in the preservice training area. Finally the provision of inservice training is primarily a State and local responsibility, and States may use funds available under the State Grant Program for this purpose.

The following chart identifies new awards for FY 1983 by priority area and focus.

NEW AWARDS IN FY 1983

Priority Category	Number of Projects		Number of Trainees
	Preservice	Inservice	
Special Educators	184		17,000
Leadership Personnel	45		450
Related Services	29		7,000
Trainers of Regular Educators	12		360
Trainers of Parents/ Volunteers	35		3,000
SEA Programming		26	100,000 1/
Special Projects		27 2/	100,000 3/

1/ Figure consists of short-term inservice trainees who are special education professionals.
2/ Figure includes both preservice and inservice projects.
3/ Figure includes both preservice and short-term inservice trainees.

Program Effectiveness: A recent Applied Management Sciences study (E.2) reported that inservice training projects for regular classroom teachers with handicapped children in their classrooms were rated as significantly more useful than "other" inservice training by the educators involved for two major reasons. The training was better targeted at the knowledge/skill

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

areas that trainees deemed more important to job performance. The training provided better coverage of knowledge/skill areas by keeping digressions to a minimum.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

2. The Status of Inservice Training to Prepare Educators to Work with Handicapped Students, Applied Management Sciences, January, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

No direct information is available on the sex or race of trainees benefitting from this program. However, many of the projects supported under this program are targeted at traditionally under-represented groups. In Fiscal Year 1983 there were:

- 31 projects to Historically Black Institutions
- 21 projects training Native Americans
- 50 projects training Bilingual/Bicultural populations

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Max Mueller, (202) 245-9886

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401

Notes

1. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

HANDICAPPED TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND INFORMATION (CFDA No. 84.030)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part D, Section 633, P.L. 91-230, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 2,000,000	$ 1,000,000
1980	2,500,000	1,000,000
1981	2,500,000	750,000
1982	1,000,000	720,000
1983	1,000,000	720,000

Purpose: To disseminate information and to provide referral services and resources for the education of handicapped children as well as to encourage students to work in various fields of special education. 1/

Eligible Applicants: Public and private agencies and organizations.

Funding Mechanism: During FY 1983 four contracts were supported: one contract for its first of three years of support and three contracts in their last of three years of support.

Duration of Assistance: The award period is for one to three years depending upon the needs of the projects. There is no provision for renewals.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program continued to be as follows:

- To disseminate information through newsletters, correspondence, and workshops about the appropriate professional care and support services required by handicapped children and youth.
- To provide practical legal information to organizations and individuals serving handicapped people through the dissemination of printed materials.
- To provide specialized management information, including options and best practices, for organizations, especially parent coalitions, operating centers for families of handicapped people.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

o To train parents to be positive and effective as (1) participants in the planning of their children's educational program and (2) advocates to the media of the rights of the handicapped.

o To increase public awareness of the needs and rights of handicapped children through the broadcasting and print media.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

o In the first year of its three year contract, the National Information Center for Handicapped Children and Youth developed and distributed information sheets to a mailing list of over 100,000. Two newsletter issues were published and sent to 1500 recipients, which addressed the issues of personnel training and the distribution of personnel in rural and culturally diverse areas. In addition, responses were generated to over 10,000 letters or telephone inquiries from individuals, agencies, and organizations seeking information to improve the educational opportunities for handicapped children and youth. Finally, the Center sponsored two workshops for professionals and one for parents during the past year.

o The Boston University School of Law, during the final year of its contract, published four issues of Focus which reached an audience of 3000 members of legal advocacy networks or State/local organizations seeking to place children in programs. The purpose of Focus is to interpret recent judicial decisions and statutory enactments, and to explain their ramifications in the disposition of placement decisions.

o The Boston Federation for Children with Special Needs disseminated management advice and operational models to a national audience of parent coalitions through a quarterly publication sent to a mailing list of approximately 3000. In addition to management information, suggestions were provided on ways to secure financial backing for parent centers and steps to take in establishing such centers.

o The Media Outreach Project, conducted by Grey-North Advertising, Inc., conducted nine workshops for parents in various geographic areas of the country.

o The preparation and distribution of media by Grey-North included the following specific accomplishments:
(1) production of five 30 to 60 second public TV and radio announcements in both English and Spanish which were sent to 740 TV stations and the three networks in New York and Los Angeles, and 5000 radio stations; and (2) development of camera-ready art which was sent to 1720 daily newspapers and 246 consumer magazines including baby and parent magazines, education and teacher magazines, home service magazines, men's magazines, consumer magazines, and women's magazines.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program data indicate three types of benefits (Section E.1 below). The program has sponsored 12 workshops for parents and professionals to provide direct technical assistance and training. A substantial amount of written information was disseminated to over 17,000 lay and professional persons involved in the education of handicapped children and youth through newsletters, two series of quarterlies, and correspondence. Finally, media campaigns to increase the general public's awareness of the needs of the handicapped were conducted through print, radio, and television announcements. It is estimated that 80 to 100 million people were reached at least once with the TV media campaign. When radio is included, 120 to 130 million people were reached at least once.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Helene Corradino, (202) 472-3740.

Program studies: Carol Chelemer, (202) 245-9401.

Notes

1. Program activity information provided for 1983 reflects activities prior to the enactment of the Education of the Handicapped Act amendments of 1983.

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED--RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION ACTIVITIES (CFDA No. 84.023)

Highlights

Funding of the Minority Research Institute. First research institute funded focusing on minority children. (II.A)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part E; Section 641 and 642, Public Law 91-230 as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1441, 1442. (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$22,000,000	$20,000,000
1980	$24,000,000	$20,000,000
1981	$26,000,000	$15,000,000
1982	$20,000,000	$10,800,000
1983	$20,000,000	$12,000,000

Purpose: To improve the education of handicapped children through research and development projects, and model programs (demonstrations).

Eligible Recipients: State or local educational agencies, public and private institutions of higher learning, and other public or non-profit educational or research agencies and organizations. In addition, the Secretary may award contracts to profitmaking organizations.

Allowable Activities: Recipients may use funds for research, surveys or demonstrations related to education of handicapped children, including the development and conduct of model programs designed to meet the special education needs of such children. Both grants and contracts may be awarded.

Award Procedures: In FY 1983 there were nine separate competitions, corresponding to the first nine priorities. (II.A)

Range and Average of Awards: $4,000 to $500,000; $105,000.

Performance Period: Variable

Obligations of Recipients: Progress and fiscal reports are required, as well as a final report at the completion of the project.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

FY 83 funds were allocated according to the following funding categories:

1. Field-Initiated Research: To support grants for non-directed research into subjects which are suggested by applicants from the field and which are judged to be responsive to the educational needs of handicapped children.

2. Minority Research Institutes: To support long-term programmatic research into attitudes of families and communities regarding various handicapping conditions and how these attitudes affect early intervention for handicapped minority children.

3. Research on Technology: To support research on the educational use by handicapped students of technological devices and systems in schools.

4. Assessment Research: To support research into student outcomes, effectiveness of services, and validity of techniques and instruments for assessment of handicapped children.

5. Secondary Age-Level Projects: To support research activities related to the transitional needs of secondary-aged handicapped students and their families

6. Parent Projects: To examine the role of parents and families in the education of handicapped children.

7. Reading Comprehension: To provide local education agencies with methods and procedures for reviewing and analyzing the nature and extent to which the specific teaching of reading comprehension is integrated into their educational program.

8. School Based Research: To support research based on data available from school records and focused on issues related to implementation to P.L. 94-142.

9. Student Research: To provide research opportunities for graduate students as a means of enhancing their professional training.

10. Intra-agency Projects and Other Research: To support projects on specific goals which ED shares with other agencies.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The program awarded grants and contracts in the following manner:

Priority Area	Amount	Number of Awards
1. Field-initiated research	$3,600,000	38
2. Minority institutes	$2,300,000	2

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

Priority Area	Amount	Number of Awards
3. Technology research	$2,200,000	17
4. Assessment research	$ 875,000	3
5. Secondary-age projects	$ 780,000	9
6. Parent projects	$ 700,000	13
7. Reading comprehension	$ 460,000	1
8. School-based research	$ 315,000	7
9. Student research	$ 250,000	26
10. Intra-agency research	$ 520,000	5

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

The outcomes of this program can be divided into three categories: (1) new or improved products (assessment instruments, instructional materials, etc.); (2) research findings and new information; and (3) personnel trained in research methods (E.1).

(1) Examples of new or improved products include:

- Validated instructional materials packages especially for mentally retarded, blind, and speech impaired children.
- Program guides for teachers and counselors in areas such as vocational programming.
- Guides for administrators dealing with the implementation of P.L. 94-142.
- A variety of products such as:
  - a "lifelong learning" curriculum for handicapped persons at the community college level;
  - a science curriculum adapted for the blind;
  - a development test for young severely handicapped children; and
  - instructional materials designed to improve nonhandicapped children's attitudes toward the handicapped.

(2) Research findings: Results from The Early Childhood Research Institutes were received in FY 1983. The Institutes reported new research findings in over 400 books, chapters and articles in professional journals, and gave over 700 workshops and conference presentations based on their findings during the term of the institutes. Over 50 percent of the applications submitted under the research program contained references to previous research findings of the institutes.

(3) Research training: Since 1975 more than 300 graduate students in colleges and universities have received support through the student research

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

grant program. In addition, the research institutes in the areas of Early childhood education and Learning Disabilities have provided training opportunities for over 200 students over a five year period.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Description of Programs for Education of the Handicapped. October 1, 1983, Office of Special Education Programs, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operation: Slagle Allbritton, (202) 245-0085

Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

DISCRETIONARY GRANTS FOR HANDICAPPED-
MEDIA SERVICES AND CAPTIONED FILMS
(CFDA No. 84.026)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part F; Sections 651-654, 20 U.S.C. 1451-1454; P.L. 91-230 as amended. (Expires September 30, 1986.)

Funding Since FY 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$25,000,000	$19,000,000
1980	$27,000,000	$19,000,000
1981	$29,000,000	$17,000,000
1982	$19,000,000	$11,520,000
1983	$19,000,000	$12,000,000

Purpose:

- o To contribute to the general welfare of deaf persons by (1) bringing to such persons understanding and appreciation of those films which play such an important part in the general and cultural advancement of hearing persons, (2) providing through these films enriched educational and cultural experiences through which deaf persons can be brought into better touch with the realities of their environment, and (3) providing a wholesome and rewarding experience which deaf persons may share together.

- o To promote the educational advancement of handicapped persons by (1) carrying on research in the use of educational media for the handicapped, (2) producing and distributing educational media for the use of handicapped persons and others who work with them, and (3) training persons in the use of educational media for the instruction of the handicapped.

Allowable Activities: Contracts and grants may be given to conduct research in the use of educational and training films and other educational media for the handicapped. Contracts and grants also provide for the training in use of educational media of teachers, parents, and others who work with the handicapped. The program is authorized to acquire, produce, and distribute films and other related media, and media equipment.

Eligibility Requirements:

- o Applicant Eligiblity: Public and private agencies, profit and non-profit organizations, or groups may submit proposals and applications for projects.

- o Beneficiary Eligibility: Handicapped persons, their families, their actual or potential employers, and those persons involved in activities for the advancement of the handicapped.

Reporting Requirements: On captioned films, report cards are mailed to distribution centers to show usage. On projects, monthly progress reports and annual reports are required to be sent to the Project Officer.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Funds appropriated for this program support the captioned film service for the deaf, the National Theater for the Deaf, and Recordings for the Blind. These activities consumed in FY 83 $8.1 million of the $12 million budget. The balance was divided between media and materials technology and marketing.

The priority for these two categories is to assure the appropriate availability, quality and use of advances in educational technology. (F.1)

Funding categories for FY 83 were:

1. Captioning: Increase accessibility of television and film to approximately 14 million deaf or hearing-impaired persons by developing, adapting, producing, and distributing materials that incorporate the most recent technological advancements in film and television.

2. Media and materials technology. Improve the education, independent functioning, and employment of handicapped individuals by assuring that the advances in educational technology are (1) available, (2) of good quality, and (3) used appropriately. Funds support projects to improve software for use in special education programming for mild and moderately handicapped children, and to develop devices to compensate for a particular handicapping condition which might impede the educational achievement.

3. Marketing and awareness. Improve the availability of quality materials for handicapped children through dissemination activities, and through adaptation of existing curriculum materials for use with secondary-level students with mild handicapping conditions.

4. National Theater of the Deaf: Provide support for the National Theater of the Deaf in order to (1) raise public awareness about the capabilities and creativeness of handicapped persons and (2) provide for the educational and cultural advancement of deaf students who participate with the National Theater.

5. Recording for the Blind: Provide tape-recorded textbooks to help visually impaired students of all ages overcome barriers to learning.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Funds for FY 83 were spent as follows:

		Amount	No. of Projects
1.	Captioning	$ 7,065,000	63
2.	Technology	2,680,000	16
3.	Marketing and awareness	1,205,000	5
4.	National Theater of the Deaf	500,000	1
5.	Recordings for the Blind, Inc.	550,000	1
		$12,000,000	86

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

- Captioned general-interest films were shown 50,117 times in the 6-month period covered in the evaluation. The total audience count was 993,834 for the same period. No cost data were available (E.1).

- Captioned educational films were shown to audiences totalling 1,988,366 in FY 1982, an increase of 19.5 percent over the previous year. (E.2) Average cost per film was $9,950 (E.1).

- Two media and material centers completed the final year of a three-year contract during FY 1983. The Educational Media Production Project for the Hearing Impaired (University of Nebraska) indicated in its final report that 110 instructional materials were reviewed for suitability for hearing impaired students, of which 48 were approved for use in instructional settings. In addition, sixteen products were developed in the area of enhancing self-esteem for hearing-impaired learners, and improvements were made in several filmstrips developed in previous years, including the following videotapes: Usable Law; Basic Economics; and Teaching Good Manners and Behaviors. Out of 19 products adapted or developed during the three year contract period, 17 have been accepted for publication. (E.4)

- The Instructional Media Production Project for Severely Handicapped Students (George Peabody College/Vanderbilt University) produced the following materials: one videotape with print materials, two computer software programs with print materials, one videotape production manual, and one catalog of films and tapes. A primary focus of these materials during 1983 was job preparation and skills development.

- The Market Linkage Project for Special Education (LINC) completed the third year of a three-year contract. As the major vehicle for the SEP marketing program, LINC continued to be a major resource to other major SEP projects, such as the National Media Development Project for the Hearing Impaired and the National Center for Media and Materials for the Severely Handicapped. An estimated 250,000 school aged children have benefited from the placement of SEP products into commerical and national distribution through this project. (E.3)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Rapid Feedback Assessment of the Captioned Film Loan Service for the Deaf. September 1982.

2. Summary Report on Education Captioned Film Usage 1980-1982. January 1983.

3. Final Report, Market Linkage Project for Special Education, October 13, 1983.

4. Final Report, Educational Media Project for the Hearing Impaired. University of Nebraska, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

1. Division of Educational Services Technology and Marketing Branch Budget Planning. FY 1984.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Slagle Allbritton, (202) 245-0085

Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED ACT--SPECIAL STUDIES
(No CFDA Entry)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education of the Handicapped Act, Part B, Section 618, P.L. 91-230 as amended. 20 U.S.C. 1418 (1976). (Expires September 30, 1986)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$2,300,000
1980	"	$1,000,000
1981	"	$1,000,000
1982	$2,300,000	$ 480,000
1983	$2,300,000	$ 480,000

Purpose: To measure and evaluate the impact of the Education of the Handicapped Act and the effectiveness of State efforts to assure the free, appropriate public education of all handicapped children.

Method of Operation: The program conducts, directly or by grant or contract, such studies, investigations and evaluations as are necessary to assess the effects of this program.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Priorities for FY 83:

- To report to Congress on the progress of implementation of P.L. 94-142.
- To continue gathering information on current and emerging trends in special education.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

No new projects were initiated during FY 1983. Two previously-funded projects were continued:

- Analysis of State Data, submitted in accordance with EHA-B for inclusion in the Annual Report to Congress.
- Information Network, operated by the National Association of State Directors of Special Education. Througn a network of State, local, and intermediate education agencies information was gathered on current and emerging trends in the implementation of special education programs. This information serves as a basis upon which this program determines

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

technical assistance priorities. Recent analyses included "Selected Issues in Service Delivery to Deaf-Blind Children," and "Priority Technical Assistance Needs of State Education Agencies." The data submitted by States was analyzed and presented to Congress.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness: Analysis of studies (E.1) has led to the following changes.

a) Developed procedures for validating the State child count data under P.L. 94-142.

b) Materials for use in State agency inservice training programs regarding exemplary practices in determining the least restrictive environment placement of handicapped chidren.

c) Guidelines to be used by the Department of Education in reviewing a State's request for a partial waiver of the non-supplant requirement in P.L. 94-142.

d) Technical assistance material on problems and successful practices in the following areas: child count, child find, individualized education programs, and interagency cooperation.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. FY 1983 Annual Report to Congress: Summaries of Special Studies.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Slagle Allbritton, (202) 245-0085

Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF HANDICAPPED RESEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.133)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title II of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	50,000,000	31,500,000
1980	75,000,000	31,487,500 1/
1981	90,000,000	29,750,000
1982	35,000,000	28,560,000 2/
1983	35,000,000	31,560,000 3/

Purpose: To support research and its utilization to improve the lives of the physically and mentally handicapped, especially the severely disabled. To provide for the administration and conduct of rehabilitation research and the dissemination of information to rehabilitation professionals and handicapped persons concerning developments in rehabilitation procedures, methods, and devices.

Organization: NIHR's research activities are conducted in part through "Center" programs, each with a core area of investigation. These programs include 31 Research and Training Centers, 18 Rehabilitation Engineering Centers and a Rehabilitation Research Institute (RRI). In addition, there are individual projects, each of which works on a narrower, more specific problem in research or dissemination. There is also a special program of international research supported by separately authorized funds.

Eligibility: Grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts may be awarded to States, public, private, or nonprofit agencies and organizations.

Application and Award Process: NIHR establishes a long-range research agenda and discretionary grants or contracts are made to universities, public and private research organizations, and individual researchers to conduct projects in areas relevant to the agenda.

Duration and Phasing of Activities: Funding of grants or contracts ranges from one to five years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

- To formulate a comprehensive Long-Range Research Plan to guide present and future research activities (E-1), (E-5), (E-7).
- To disseminate information about new developments from research activities for improvements of services to handicapped persons (E-6), (E-7).

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A Long-Range Research Plan was established with emphasis placed on the priority areas of mental illness, mental retardation, vocational rehabilitation, independent living, development of technological systems, private sector involvement in device development, network development for dissemination and utilization of research findings, and continuing research and development (E-1), (E-7).
- Project products that have been disseminated are listed in Section II F.
  - -- In addition information on rehabilitation developments will now be included in the journal, Aids and Applications Review, published by the Carroll Center for the Blind. This journal is currently sent to 2,000 subscribers nationally.
  - -- The National Rehabilitation Information Center (NARIC) continues to offer various information services to the entire U.S. rehabilitation community, as well as users overseas. It has a definitive NIHR data base of 6,000 items and has published a thesaurus, a catalog of NARIC subjects, and the Pathfinder. NARIC is phasing in ABLEDATA, a computerized data-bank on equipment and assistive devices for disabled people.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope and costs:

The major operating programs and activities funded under the Rehabilitation Act are Research and Training Centers, Rehabilitation Engineering Centers, Research Utilization and Dissemination Projects, Research Projects, International Support, and Research Fellowships.

	Actual		Estimate
	1982	1983	1984
Number of projects:			
Research and training centers	26	31	34
Rehabilitation engineering centers	17	18	17
Discrete projects	26	35	82
Fellowships	--	17	15
Total	69	101	148

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Some 300 individual studies are under way at any given time, and 600 training programs serving 60,000 participants are conducted annually.

The NIHR appropriation for FY 1983 was $31.6 million. Of this, approximately $15.2 million was devoted to the RTC program; $7.5 million to the REC program; $5.9 million to discrete grants and contracts for research; and $2.5 million for research utilization. Fellowships accounted for $.5 million.

Research and Training Centers Program (RTC) (E-2)

Of the 31 RTCs funded in FY 1983, there were twelve medical RTCs funded. Their work covers many medical areas, such as cardiopulmonary disease, spinal cord injury, health care delivery, special problems of the severely impaired, biofeedback, and neuromuscular dysfunctions.

There are, in addition, five vocational rehabilitation RTCs, two on deafness, one on psychosocial research, two on mental illness, three on mental retardation, two on aging, one on independent living, one on blindness, and two on Native Americans.

Rehabilitation Engineering Centers (REC) (E-4)

Eighteen Rehabilitation Engineering Centers were funded in fiscal year 1983 with the purpose of (1) developing innovative methods of applying advanced medical technology, scientific achievement, and psychiatric, psychological, and social knowledge to solve rehabilitation problems; (2) developing systems of technical and engineering information exchange and (3) improving the distribution of technology devices and equipment to handicapped individuals.

The developments of the Centers included (1) a muscle fatigue monitor targeted for handicapped persons whose dysfunction primarily stems from neuromuscular disorders, (2) a wearable spectral tactile speech aid, (3) an Available Motions Inventory Test apparatus to evaluate the severely disabled person's potential for work including the design of adapted work stations.

Discrete Grant Awards (E-3)

Approximately $3.1 million was obligated through individual grant awards, contracts, and one Rehabilitation Research Institute (RRI). The latter has a core area of job development and placement for severely handicapped persons. The remaining individual grant awards were for research in the broad areas of psychological and medical problems, sensory disabilities, spinal cord injury, severe burns, and other specific problems. In addition, about $2.5 million was devoted to research utilization projects which mainly offer coordinated dissemination and information services, promote innovations in service programs based on R&D results, and instill an awareness of change processes.

Program Effectiveness: Studies of the major component programs of NIHR have been completed. First, the Research and Training Center program was studied (E-2). Major findings are as follows:

- The RTC Program has a sound conceptual base, the synergistic interaction of research, training, and client services being especially effective.
- The RTC Program is an effective resource magnet; that is, it was able to attract an additional 75 cents from other sources for every dollar NIHR awarded to the Centers.
- The RTC Program has supplied many noteworthy innovations to the field of rehabilitation.

Secondly, the Rehabilitation Engineering Center program has been studied (E-4). Major findings are as follows:

- The program has been successful in defining "Rehabilitation Engineering".
- The program needs:
  - Closer work with industry to develop and market assistive devices;
  - Closer liaison with other sectors of the rehabilitation service community;
  - Expanded technical assistance at the Federal level;
  - Clarification of goals,
  - More systematic information on devices, etc., that are available;
  - Development of a systematic capacity for development, evaluation, and distribution of assistive devices by working with industry.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

NIHR has proposed a program of field-initiated research grants in which the investigator is free to propose research in any area authorized by the law. This program will be used to respond to urgent problems, pursue innovative research approaches, and expand research capacity and utility.

In response to suggestions made by the evaluation study, the REC program is (1) developing a plan to work more closely with industry in developing and marketing devices to aid handicapped persons; and (2) through the Interagency Committee, working more closely than before with other Federal agencies on this same matter.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C above

1. NIHR Long-Range Plan, Vol. 1, 1980
2. "Research & Training Centers - Overview" (1980) (Special Centers Office -- In-house document)

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C above (Continued)

3. "Annual Report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration to the President and the Congress on Federal Activities Related to the Administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973" (1980) (ch. on NIHR, pp. 44-64)

4. "Rehabilitation Engineering Center Program Evaluation: Final Report (Berkeley Planning Associates, Berkeley, California)

5. "Goals and the Goal-Setting Processes in the Research and Training Program" (Abt Associates, Cambridge, Massachusetts)

6. "Final Report on An Evaluation of Two RSA (NIHR) Research Utilization Laboratories" (National Institute for Advanced Studies, Washington, D.C.) 1980.

7. "NIHR Research Priorities Plan: Issues and Recommendations for knowledge Dissemination and Utilization" (ICD) Rehabilitation and Research Center, New York, N.Y.) 1980.

F. Other Supporting Data

The following products have been disseminated:

-- A new approach to chronic pain based on behaviorial sciences. The results especially address chronic illness.

-- A strategy by the New England Regional Pediatric Trauma Institute for identifying the most cost effective and optimal levels of medical and rehabilitation services for disabled children.

-- A evaluation system for assessing how well the living arrangements in community based residential settings are meeting the needs of the mentally ill and assisting families in the reintegration of the mentally ill into the family.

-- Bio-feedback techniques to control muscle contractions in stroke patients allowing some persons to walk independently of braces and other devices.

-- The Preliminary Diagnostic Questionnaire for use by State agencies and private rehabilitation facilities for assessing the employability of a person.

-- A muscle fatigue monitor to measure muscle fatigue during therapeutics, workplace, or surgical reconstruction activities. The monitor is used especially on handicapped children with cerebral palsy and myelomeningocole.

F. Other Supporting Data (Continued)

- -- A wearable spectral tactile speech aid for use by the deaf and deaf-blind in face-to-face communication with nondeaf individuals.
- -- The Available Motions Inventory Test apparatus for evaluating the severely disabled person's potential for work.
- -- Criteria for prediction of successful rehabilitation for persons with end-stage renal disease, including the dynamics of psychological adjustment after onset of renal disease.
- -- Development of ways to identify specific problems in rehabilitation of multiple sclerosis patients and multi-speciality approaches to resolution of clinical, medical, psychological, and social needs.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

There are no studies of this program currently under way.

Contacts for further information

Program operations: Betty Jo Berland, (202) 472-6551

Program Studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. Transfers to: Office of Personnel Management ($40,000), President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped ($250,000), Maternal and Child Health Agency ($335,000), U.S. Information Agency ($158,000), and Agency for International Development ($200,000).
2. Transfers from: National Institute of Mental Health ($500,000).
3. Includes a $1.5 million supplemental appropriation for the establishment of two research and training centers. The awards for these centers -- one for pediatrics and one for disabled Pacific Basin residents -- will not be made until FY 1984.

REHABILITATION SERVICES--BASIC SUPPORT
(CFDA No. 84.126)

Highlights

- o Legislation was proposed that would provide incentives for rehabilitating the severely handicapped, provide greater flexibility, and require stricter accountability standards. Reauthorizing legislation was passed in Fall, 1983 (II.D).
- o Progress toward operational goals was made in the following areas: job development and placement, services to severely disabled, IWRP/IEP coordination and services to deaf-blind and learning disabled (II.A.B.).
- o The number of cases served and rehabilitated has continued to decline for both severely and non-severely handicapped clients. However, the proportion of severely handicapped persons among those served and rehabilitated continued to increase (II.C).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973; P.L. 93-112 as amended by P.L. 93-516, 94-230, 97-35, and 95-602, 29 U.S.C. 701, Title I, Parts A and B except Section 112.

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1979	$808,000,000	$ 817,484,000
1980	880,000,000	817,484,000
1981	945,000,000	854,259,000
1982	899,000,000	863,040,000
1983	943,900,000	943,900,000

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to persons with mental and/or physical handicaps. Priority service is placed on needs of those persons with the most severe disabilities.

Overview: Federal and State funds are used to cover the costs of providing rehabilitation services which include: diagnosis, comprehensive evaluation, counseling, training, reader services for the blind, interpreter services for the deaf, and employment placement. Funds are used also for assistance with payment for medical and related services and prosthetic and orthotic devices, transportation to secure vocational rehabilitation services, maintenance during rehabilitation, tools, licenses, equipment, supplies, and other goods and services; for vending stands or other small businesses for handicapped persons including management and supervisory services; and for assistance in the construction and establishment of

I. Program Profile (Continued)

rehabilitation facilities. Services are provided to families of handicapped individuals when such services will contribute substantially to the rehabilitation of those who are being provided vocational rehabilitation services.

At the Federal level, program policy, leadership, and monitoring are the responsibilities of the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) and the Commissioner of the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). Monitoring activities are implemented by RSA's ten regional offices.

Eligibility: Applicant eligibility is limited to State agencies designated as the sole State agency to administer the vocational rehabilitation program. Beneficiary eligibility for vocational rehabilitation services is based on the presence of a physical and/or mental disability, which constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment, and where a vocational rehabilitation service may reasonably be expected to benefit the individual in terms of employability.

Applicant Requirements: Applicants prepare three year State plans for vocational rehabilitation services (meeting Federal requirements established under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended) effective October 1, 1982 and covering fiscal years 1983-1985. Vocational rehabilitation agencies submit project proposals to the appropriate ED regional office. State plans are submitted to the RSA Regional Program Offices for approval not later than July 1, of the third year of each three-year cycle, commencing July 1, 1979. The State agency must certify the availability of State funds to fulfill a 20 percent matching requirement.

Determination of Grant Amounts: Federal funds are distributed to States based on population weighted by per capita income. The statistical factors for fund allocation are: (1) the three-year average of per capita income by State; (2) the total U.S. population and State population; (3) the Consumer Price Index.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual and quarterly progress reports, annual budget and case service reports, and annual program and financial plans are required. Audits are conducted by the ED Audit Agency and by site visits of regional staff. Both are periodic with no set schedule. State audits are made in accordance with OMB Circular A-102. Case records on individual clients and fiscal records for a prescribed period are also required for audit purposes. Services to individual clients must be provided in accordance with an Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan (IWRP). This program has maintenance of effort requirements.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives: During FY 1983, the Department's principal objective with respect to program direction was to develop a legislative proposal for the program's reauthorization (see Section II.D).

In the area of program operations, RSA had the following goals for the Basic State Grants program, FY 1983:

o Job Development and Job Placement: To improve the capacity of the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program to place disabled persons in employment, especially those who are severely disabled, by strengthening the job development and job placement phases of the vocational rehabilitation process, including the establishment of job placement units in each designated State agency.

o Internal Management Improvement: To improve the internal management of RSA by (1) implementing a new organizational structure; (2) developing and implementing a formal comprehensive planning process; (3) developing and implementing a formal communication system; and (4) implementing an agency policy system.

o Facilities Offering Services for Severely Disabled Individuals: To improve the planning and delivery of rehabilitation services to disabled individuals by increasing the effective use of public and private nonprofit rehabilitation facilities.

o IWRP/IEP Joint Planning: To facilitate joint planning on behalf of handicapped students by enhancing the cooperative linkages between special education and vocational rehabilitation.

o Deaf-Blind Program: To establish a base of information and skills to improve or expand rehabilitation and independent living services to deaf-blind persons.

o Learning Disabled Individuals: To improve the capability of State VR agencies to deliver services to disabled and multiply handicapped individuals who have a specific learning disability.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

o Reauthorization. The Department's reauthorization proposal was sent to the Congress in March, 1983.

o RSA has undertaken a range of activities to accomplish its FY 1983 objectives:

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- o Job Development and Job Placement. Regional offices have been identifying replicable activities and demonstrations, information sharing activities have been increased, special training projects have been reviewed, and States have been assisted to provide information to business on the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit.
- o IWRP/IEP Joint Planning. Regional offices have completed reviewing past and current efforts to develop cooperative agreements between special education and vocational rehabilitation agencies. Cooperative programs have been identified, site reviews of cooperative projects have been conducted in nine regions, and plans for a national dissemination forum have begun.
- o Deaf-Blind Program. Data on the incidence of deaf-blindness have been analyzed and shared with regional offices, task forces have met to assess needs, training activities have been conducted, and a survey of deaf-blind clients has been conducted.
- o Learning Disabled Individuals. Progress toward this objective included conducting a state of the art conference, identifying issues, launching case studies to identify model programs, and developing technical assistance plans.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 has resulted in a vocational rehabilitation system that is increasingly focused on the severely handicapped. Program data indicate that since 1979 the number of persons served has decreased. Severely disabled persons comprise a higher proportion of closed cases, both those rehabilitated and those not rehabilitated. However, the number of severely disabled persons served has also declined. The following table summarizes these trends:

Impact Data

	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983
Applicants accepted for vocational rehabilitation...	411,560	412,356	373,310	333,437	349,932
Total Active Cases..........	1,127,551	1,095,139	1,038,232	958,537	938,923
Cases closed, rehabilitated .	288,325	277,136	255,881	226,924	216,230
Severely disabled............	143,375	142,545	138,380	129,866	124,766
Nonseverely disabled..........	144,950	134,591	117,501	97,058	91,465
Severely disabled, percent....	(49.9%)	(51.4%)	(54.1%)	(57.2%)	(57.7%)

II. Response to GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

Cases closed, not rehabilitated	156,258	152,672	157,682	142,575	134,118
Severely disabled	87,541	91,346	95,465	90,567	86,136
Nonseverely disabled	68,717	61,326	62,220	52,008	47,982
Severely disabled, percent	(56.0%)	(59.8%)	(60.5%)	(63.5%)	(64.2%)

For 1981, the most recent year for which data are available, rehabilitated persons had the following major disabling conditions:

Major Disabling Condition	Number	Percent
Total Reporting Disability	249,902	100.0
Blindness	9,509	3.8
Other Visual Impairments	13,735	5.5
Deafness	7,212	2.9
Other Hearing Impairments	10,086	4.0
Orthopedic Impairments	56,265	22.5
Absence or Amputation of Extremities	6,444	2.6
Mental Illness	48,539	19.4
Alcoholism	12,221	4.9
Drug Addiction	3,111	1.2
Mental Retardation	29,075	11.6
Hay Fever and Asthma	1,617	0.6
Diabetes	3,870	1.5
Epilepsy	4,844	1.9
Heart Disease	6,845	2.7
All Other Circulatory Conditions	2,743	1.1
Respiratory System Conditions	1,750	0.7
Digestive System Conditions	10,960	4.4
Genitourinary Conditions	6,508	2.6
Speech Impairments	1,788	0.7
All Other Disabling Conditions	21,780	5.1

Accurate and timely information is not available to determine the full cost of services to vocational rehabilitation clients. The Department is currently planning to develop the data necessary to assess both costs and long-term benefits of program participation.

There have been many studies and analyses of different aspects of this program including studies conducted under research and demonstration authorities, program administrative and management reviews conducted as part of RSA's annual work plans and contracted evaluation studies. During FY 1983, two evaluation studies were completed:

II. Response to GEPA 417(a) (Continued)

- Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Agreements Between State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies and State Associations of Student Financial Aid Offices. The objective of the research project was to assess the effectiveness of the voluntary coordination agreements between VR agencies and Student Financial Aid associations in helping to serve VR clients and in making sensible and efficient use of the various resources and programs that are available to support the training of disabled persons.

- Needs Assessment of Services to Deaf-Blind Individuals. This study interviewed service providers, recipients, and parents. Areas of identified need were: parent education, job development and placement, attention to independent living, recreational programs, care for older deaf-blind individuals, extended education (up to age 25), and more research.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In the spring the Administration proposed legislation that would reward the States for good performance in rehabilitating the most severely disabled; provide greater flexibility in the means of service delivery; and require stricter accountability to objective standards of program performance. The proposed legislation would also provide for administrative simplification of the Basic State Grants program by streamlining Federal requirements and permitting more coordinated planning at the State level.

A review of RSA's goals and objectives for 1984 indicate that most of the program's 1983 goals will be pursued in 1984. These goals are to increase the number of disabled people in remunerative employment, to improve and maintain effective management of the vocational rehabilitation service delivery system, to assure that special education and rehabilitation service delivery systems provide for a continuum of services to disabled individuals from childhood to adulthoood, and to increase the capacity of rehabilitation facilities to provide a full range of quality services for their clients.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration. Caseload Statistics, State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies, Fiscal Year 1982, Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-83-35, June 21, 1983.

2. Damans and Associates, Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Agreements Between State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies and State Associations of Student Financial Aid Offices, Gaithersburg, Maryland, May 31, 1983.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses (Continued)

3. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Rehabilitation Services Administration. Characteristics of Persons Rehabilitated in Fiscal Year 1980, Information Memorandum, RSA-IM-83-40, September 13, 1982.

4. Wolf, Enid G., et al. Needs Assessment of Services to Deaf-Blind Individuals. Redex, Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland, December 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity of Persons Rehabilitated by State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies: 1981

Items	1981	
	Number	Percent
Total Rehabilitations	255,881	--
Age at Referral		
Number Reporting Age	249,939	100.0
Under 18 years	24,670	9.9
18-19 Years	22,919	9.2
20-24 Years	41,219	16.5
25-34 Years	63,519	25.4
35-44 Years	39,475	15.8
45-54 Years	30,454	12.2
55-64 Years	18,621	7.5
65 Years and Over	9,062	3.6
Mean Age	33.5 Years	
Sex		
Number Reporting Sex	250,885	100.0
Male	131,056	52.2
Female	119,829	47.8
Race		
Number Reporting Race	250,138	100.0
White	200,572	80.2
Black	44,779	17.9
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1,314	0.5
Asian and Pacific Islander	3,473	1.4
Hispanic Origin		
Number Reporting Ethnicity	250,381	100.0
Persons of Hispanic Origin	15,777	6.3
Persons Not of Hispanic Origin	234,604	93.7

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Only one evaluation study is currently in progress: "An Evaluation of the Delivery of Services to Selected Disabled People by Vocational Rehabilitation." The study focuses on vocational rehabilitation services to minorities and is being conducted by Lawrence Johnson and Associates.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Mark Shoob, (202) 472-9120
Program Studies: Beatrice F. Birman, (202) 245-7997

Notes

1. Includes amounts for Federal maintenance of effort under a separate authorization.

2. These are expenditures made by State rehabilitation agencies for the purchase of services for clients. Excluded are administrative costs and counselor salaries.

CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP) (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 112 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. (Expired September 30, 1983)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 3,500,000	$ 3,500,000
1980	3,500,000	3,500,000
1981	3,500,000	2,800,000
1982	3,500,000	942,000
1983	3,500,000	1,734,000

Purpose: To provide counselors who can assist physically and mentally handicapped persons to understand all available benefits under the Rehabilitation Act, and to help such persons to overcome any difficulties they may be having with the vocational rehabilitation service delivery system. Projects also are expected to make recommendations for policy and method changes which may be beneficial to future clients.

Applicant Eligibility: Projects may be funded, administered, and operated only by or through the State vocational rehabilitation agency. The State agency may enter into cooperative arrangements with public nonprofit organizations, such as institutions of higher education, to secure appropriate services through existing programs.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Services may be provided to physically and mentally handicapped persons, with emphasis on those with the most severe disabilities. Recipients of services must be (1) seeking vocational rehabilitation (VR) services; (2) receiving VR services; or (3) terminated from VR services and seeking help with some aspect of service.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are approved for a maximum of five years, although a project may only be continued based on annual review of accomplishments. Renewals are made through the regular application process.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: State vocational rehabilitation agencies must retain administrative and financial responsibility for projects but may subcontract aspects of day-to-day operations which are deemed to be advantageous for good management.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

1. To establish in geographically dispersed regions client assistance pilot projects to provide counselors who will advise clients of the benefits available under this Act.

2. Upon request of clients, assist in their relationship with programs providing services including pursuing the protection of their rights under this Act.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Grants were awarded to 24 applicants who received a total amount of $1,734,000 to establish client assistance projects. It is expected that these projects will establish the basis for State vocational rehabilitation agencies to assume this responsibility in subsequent years.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

The discretionary project resources available for this program in FY 1983 were $1,734,000 and were distributed for new projects. The characteristics vary among these innovative projects, and goals for the projects are not comparable. In general, experience has shown that similar projects deal with an average of 200 cases per year which require ombudsman services.

Additional benefits accrue to handicapped persons who request information about available services and techniques for accessing those services. Also, as a result of CAP investigation of client complaints, VR basic program delivery system difficulties are modified or corrected.

No studies of effectiveness have been carried out.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Rehabilitation Amendments of 1984 establish client assistance programs as a condition of States' basic grant funding. The former discretionary grant program is replaced with a formula grant for each State. Regulations will be promulgated by the Department for this new authority. The Administration proposes to discontinue Federal funding of this program after fiscal year 1984, but no change is proposed in the requirement that the availability of these services be a condition of basic State grant funding. States can provide client assistance using State or Federal basic State grant funds.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

No studies have been authorized. In the previous year (1982) a summary of project annual reports was developed and sent to Congress. This was in response to a requirement for such a report contained in Section 112 (b) (3) of the Act; however, in December 1982 this section of the Act was repealed by PL-97-375. No further reports are anticipated.

F. Other Supporting Data

The 1982 Report to Congress is available in limited number, on request.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently under way.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Lester Cole (202) 245-3187

Program studies: Barbara Coates (202) 472-9235

DISCRETIONARY PROJECT GRANTS FOR TRAINING REHABILITATION PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.129)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended, Section 304(a).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$34,000,000	$30,000,000
1980	$40,000,000	$28,500,000
1981	$45,000,000	$21,675,000
1982	$25,500,000	$19,200,000
1983	$25,500,000	$19,200,000

Purpose: To support projects to increase the numbers and improve the skills of personnel trained in providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped people.

Eligible Grant Recipients: State and local government agencies, non-profit private agencies and institutions of higher education.

Eligible Trainees: Individuals employed or preparing for employment in the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants may be made for 1 to 3 years depending on appropriation availability. Grants made usually start on or around July 1, or September 1 of each fiscal year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Grantees for in-service training programs must provide at least 10 percent of costs. All other grantees provide a negotiated proportion of costs. Annual progress and fiscal reports are required of all grantees.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- The Department's principal objective for this program was to improve the skill level and increase the numbers of rehabilitation personnel trained in manpower shortage areas.
- The second objective was to support the training of rehabilitation workers in job development and placement skills.
- A third objective was to improve, through training and communication of standards, the management of rehabilitation programs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Focused State agency efforts on Federal priorities, e.g., manpower shortage areas, training workers to enhance employability of the handicapped, coordination of vocational rehabilitation with special education.

- Facilitated the emergence and acceptability of new professional rehabilitation fields in support of enhancing the employability of the handicapped, e.g., mobility instruction, vocational evaluation.

- Developed program evaluation techniques, case review system, and a clearinghouse for all training projects and approaches.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Trainees Served: 12,680 trainees were served under 305 project grants in FY 1983. Analysis of costs by type of training (see E.1 below) is shown below:

Number of Trainees	Type of Training	Total Grant Amounts	Average Federal $ Cost Per Trainee
2,440	Long-term	12,735,000	5,219
1,750	Continuing	2,000,000	1,143
8,400	Inservice	2,800,000	333
90	Experimental	740,000	8,222

Program Scope: Program serves all skills and professions relating to vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped.

Types of Benefits Provided: This program is used for a wide variety of training including long-term training in all professional rehabilitation fields; short-term training, such as workshops, seminars, institutes, etc.; in-service training and continuing education; and experimental or innovative training projects. Benefits in the form of more effective service accrue to those handicapped persons receiving rehabilitation services who are more rapidly returned to gainful employment. Benefits accrue in terms of skills acquired, confidence gained, promotions received, etc. No funds are spent on vouchers for individuals.

Program Effectiveness: Third-party validation of overall program was not completed. A study started in 1981 was not completed because budget cuts eliminated all evaluation funds in the rehabilitation program. However, each training project has a self-or third-party evaluation component.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

To continue to allocate funds to manpower shortage areas. The Commissioner's Task Force on Rehabilitation Training is expected to make recommendations on program operation in FY 1984. The Administration has requested renewal of existing legislative authority.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Analysis of Grantee Applications, Rehabilitation Services Administration, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Martin Spickler, (202) 245-0076

Program Studies: Rodney Pelton, (202) 472-3014

GRANTS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF SEVERELY HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 93-112, Title III, Section 311(a)(1) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, 29 U.S.C. 777a.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$ 7,048,000
1980	Indefinite	9,568,000[1]
1981	Indefinite	9,765,000
1982	$12,210,000[2]	8,855,000
1983	12,210,000[2]	9,259,000

Purpose: To support demonstration projects which expand or improve the delivery of rehabilitation services to severely disabled individuals to assist them in achieving satisfactory vocational adjustment.

Eligibility: Public or private non-profit agencies and organizations are eligible to compete for grant awards.

Applicant Requirements: Special projects for severely disabled people must expand and improve rehabilitation services for particular categories of disability.

Award Process: Proposals are selected for funding through a peer review process based on regulatory selection criteria and annually announced program priorities (see II.A below).

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded for twelve-month periods and can be continued for up to 5 years. Continuation is based on an annual review of accomplishments and the availability of funds.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual fiscal reports are required, and progress reports must be submitted as prescribed by grant award specification.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's objective for this program was to fund service programs for disabled people with a wide array of disabilities and to place a special emphasis on projects that employed high technology (computer) applications.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In FY 1983, 54 projects were funded; 29 were new projects and 25 were continuations. Fourteen of the 29 new projects involved high technology (computer) applications. The breakdown of projects funded to address specific disabling conditions was as follows:

Disability	New Projects	Continuations	
Arthritis	1	1	
Blindness	5	-	
Cerebral Palsy	1	-	
Deafness	3	-	
Deaf/Blind	1	1	
Learning Disabled	2	1	
Mental Illness	5	2	
Mental Retardation	4	1	
Multiple Sclerosis	1	-	
Developmentally Disabled	-	1	
Spinal Cord Injured	-	17	
Multiple Disabilities	6	1	
	29	25	Total 54

- The program has expanded from demonstrations which served blind, deaf, and spinal cord injured persons to demonstrations for a wide array of disabilities.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Costs and Individuals Served: In Fiscal Year 1983, approximately 4,000 severely disabled clients received services at an average cost of $2,817 per client.

Program Scope: The scope of the projects covers many categories of severely disabled persons including those who are deaf, blind, or who have epilepsy, cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, mental retardation, arthritis, and other disabling conditions. General projects are also supported to coordinate existing services to more effectively reach target groups, as well as conduct outreach and support activities for those who are not yet receiving rehabilitation services.

Impact on State Practices: According to program data, successful project methods and techniques are frequently incorporated into State vocational rehabilitation agency programs, sustained with non-Federal dollars, and used in part or whole throughout a State. For example, seventeen model projects that serve individuals with spinal cord injuries have been initiated throughout the country, resulting in more effective services by State vocational rehabilitation agencies, private rehabilitation facilities, and medical institutions for individuals with this handicap.

Reported Treatment Gains: According to program data, interventions demonstrated by funded projects have resulted in substantial numbers of severely disabled persons, in all categories, becoming eligible for and benefiting from vocational rehabilitation services.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Direct Cost Benefits: One example of costs benefits, according to program data, is that demonstrations with 42 elderly blind persons in Virginia provided services to those persons in the community for $186,069; a cost savings of $131,709 over the total cost of a nursing home.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

No studies have been made regarding overall program effectiveness. Comments in Section C above are based on grantee reports submitted to the program office.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations and studies: Bob Gilmore, (202) 245-0529
Program studies: Ann Weinheimer, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. $12,500 of this amount was reprogrammed to the National Council on the Handicapped.
2. Total authorized for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314 and 315 combined.
3. Source: Rehabilitation Services Administration.

SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR INITIATING RECREATION PROGRAMS FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 316 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. (Expired September 30, 1983)

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1981	Indefinite	2,000,000
1982	$2,000,000	1,884,000
1983	2,000,000	2,000,000

Purpose: To establish or initiate programs of recreational activities for handicapped individuals, with special emphasis on expanding services for handicapped clients of State vocational rehabilitation agencies. The recreational activities carried out within these projects are diverse in scope and are intended to contribute to the handicapped person's rehabilitation.

Criteria for Evaluating Proposals: Proposals for project funding are evaluated based on the following:

- Relevancy of the project to State and Federal rehabilitation programs
- Project plan of Operation
- Quality of key project personnel
- Budget and cost-effectiveness of the project
- Impact of the project
- Likelihood of project continuing after Federal funding terminates

Applicant Eligibility: States and public and other nonprofit agencies and organizations are eligible for grants under this program.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Projects funded under this program must serve physically or mentally handicapped individuals.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded for one year.

Use of Funds: Funded projects can include indoor and outdoor leisure activities, sports, crafts, arts, hobby, therapeutic and physical-development activities including skiing, boating, swimming, and camping.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Fiscal records must be maintained and annual fiscal reports are required. Progress reports must be submitted on project operations and accomplishments.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

In view of the decision not to request future funding for this program, no special goals or objectives were established for FY 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

Not Applicable.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

In FY 1983 an estimated 15,000 handicapped individuals were served by the 27 projects funded.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

No funds were requested for this program in FY 1984. The Department believes that these services would be more appropriately provided at the local level.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b):

No studies are under way.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program operations: Frank S. Caracciolo, RSA
Room 3516 Switzer Bldg.
(202) 245-3186

Program studies: Barbara Coates (202) 472-9235

REHABILITATION SERVICES--SPECIAL PROJECTS FOR HANDICAPPED MIGRATORY AND SEASONAL FARMWORKERS (CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Rehabilitation Act of 1973, P.L. 93-112, as amended by P.L. 93-516, P.L. 94-230, and P.L. 95-602, Section 312, 29 U.S.C. 701.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$1,530,000
1980	Indefinite	1,530,000
1981	Indefinite	1,325,000
1982	1/	942,000
1983	1/	951,000

Purpose: To provide vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migratory or seasonal farmworkers which will enable them to acquire new work skills and thereby become qualified to obtain employment in other areas, or "settle out" (obtain permanent employment) and leave the migrant stream; or to provide treatment necessary for the client to continue as a migratory or seasonal farmworker.

Grantee: Migrant farmworker projects are funded by grants to State rehabilitation agencies or local agencies administering a vocational rehabilitation program under written agreements with State agencies. Funds are awarded on a 90 percent Federal/10 percent State matching basis.

Beneficiary: Physically or mentally handicapped migrants, with emphasis on those with the most severe disabilities. Family members may also receive services if the service is necessary to the rehabilitation of the handicapped migrant.

Other Requirements: The standard application forms (SF 424) as furnished by the Federal agency and required by OMB Circular No. A-102 must be used for this program. Awards are made on approval of the Director of Rehabilitation Services in the Regional office or the Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services for Central office grants. Deadline dates for the receipt of grant applications are usually set in April-June and are published in the Federal Register.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Projects may be supported for up to three years; funding is on an annual basis with continuation based on satisfactory performance and availability of funds.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual fiscal reports and periodic progress reports as specified for the particular grant.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Provide comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped migrant workers.
- Develop appropriate formats and methodology for reporting project activities and results.
- Provide opportunity for coordinating vocational rehabilitation services with services from other sources.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Established rating criteria and funded 11 projects that most clearly reflected legislative goals for the program.
- Developed and field tested format for reporting progress.
- Sponsored conference/workshop on how to report progress and how to coordinate activities with other programs.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In 1983 the program supported projects in California, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Washington, and Wisconsin. State rehabilitation agencies were grantees for these projects. Approximately 3,000 eligible migrant workers were served in these projects.

Types of Benefits Provided: Through these special projects, comprehensive vocational rehabilitation services are made available. These services include a heavy emphasis on outreach, specialized bilingual counseling, physical/mental restoration, prevocational adjustment, vocational training, and job placement. Because of the high mobility rate of the clients and their remote rural employment, it is not always possible to complete the entire rehabilitation process or provide VR services in the traditional manner.

Program Effectiveness: Regional Offices monitor projects and site visits are made to projects by Central Office Project Officers and Regional Office representatives. State agencies also monitor projects. Reports from these monitoring activities (see E.1, E.2) indicate:

- State agencies have absorbed and incorporated some projects into their ongoing operations. For example, both Florida and Texas continued to provide services after their grant monies were exhausted.
- Projects have been successful in developing innovative methods and techniques to assist this target population. Much of this effort has been concentrated on developing better contact with handicapped migrants. These efforts include increased use of bilingual counselors and the provision of information and services in areas with high concentrations of migrants.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (cont.)

- Annual conferences enable Project Directors to consider and develop effective methods to improve project operations. The most recent conference concentrated on improved reporting, developing interagency cooperation, and special health problems of migrant workers such as pesticide poisoning.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Program efforts in the coming year will center on improving data collection activities and developing procedures for reaching unserved eligible migrant workers.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

1. Monitoring reports from regional offices.
2. Descriptive data supplied by projects in response to field test of reporting format.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Lester Cole, (202) 245-3187

Program Studies: Jerry Burns, (202) 245-8877

Notes

1. Authorization of $12,210,000 for Sections 310, 311, 312, 314, and 315. Authorization is for "such sums as may be necessary" for Part B (except section 313). Five percent is for section 312, plus an additional amount is authorized to equal a total of $5,000,000.

HELEN KELLER NATIONAL CENTER FOR DEAF-BLIND YOUTHS AND ADULTS
(CFDA No. 84.128)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Public Law 93-112 Section 313 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	indefinite	$ 2,500,000
1980	indefinite	2,500,000
1981	indefinite	3,200,000
1982	$ 3,500,000	3,137,000
1983	3,500,000	3,500,000

Purpose: To provide comprehensive services for the most severely disabled and disadvantaged deaf-blind youths and adults, train personnel to work with deaf-blind persons, and conduct relevant research.

History and Award Process: The Helen Keller National Center was created by Congress in 1969; specific funding has been authorized by Congress since 1973 on a non-competitive basis. The Center has one primary facility at Sands Point, New York, and deaf-blind individuals are referred from all 50 States through the Center's network of nine regional offices.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)(1)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To improve rehabilitation services to deaf-blind individuals.
- To foster research and development activities which may enable deaf-blind persons to lead improved social and economic lives.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1983 the following was accomplished:

- The Center decreased the average amount of time necessary for a deaf-blind client to remain within a training program from 18 months to 11 months. The National Training Team and the Affiliation Network System were developed to strengthen services to deaf-blind persons at the local level.

- Research on the deaf-blind and the services available to them was conducted. It indicated that substantial gains had been made in their education, but large areas of unmet or inadequately met needs remained. (E.1)

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: During FY 1983 the Center served 150 trainees at its main facility and provided referrals and counseling to another 675 deaf-blind persons through its regional offices.

Program Effectiveness: No program effectiveness data are available on this program. Information on this program was collected and analyzed (See reference E.1) as program descriptions.

Program Description -- The perceptions of various interviewees in a 1982 study are presented as follows (E.1):

Perceptions of 33 administrators of programs for deaf-blind students:

- Even though funding is adequate, about 10 percent of deaf-blind children are not being served.
- Almost one-third of the teachers of deaf-blind children do not have bachelors degrees.
- Parents of older deaf-blind students lack interest and do not participate in school activities.
- Most administrators believe that deaf-blind students will have difficulty making a living after they complete school.

Perceptions of 62 teachers of deaf-blind students:

- Teachers expressed poor opinions of their own and their colleagues' preparation to deliver the professional services required of them.
- Most teachers believe that their students will not be able to earn or contribute to their own living or be able to live independently.

Perceptions of 50 deaf-blind adults:

- Deaf-blind adults are displeased with their education.
- About 16 percent are unemployed.
- Most deaf-blind adults are fairly pleased with their living arrangements.
- Earning a living is viewed as their greatest problem.
- The areas of greatest need are vocational training, financial aid, and communication training.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

Needs Assessment of Services to Deaf-Blind Individuals, Redex, Inc., Rehabilitation and Education Experts, Inc. December 1982, ED Contract No. 300-81-0426.

F. Other Supporting Data:

The following estimates of deaf-blindness were prepared from data gathered by the National Center for Health Statistics' Annual Health Interview Survey of 1977.

Estimates of Deaf-Blindness

I. Civilian Noninstitutionalized Populations	
Overall	734,275
Narrowly defined	41,859
Deaf and Severely Visually Impaired	67,340
Blind and Severely Hearing Impaired	399,677
Other Categories	225,399
II. Institutionalized Populations	
Overall	13,182
Narrowly defined	3,451
Deaf and Severely Visually Impaired	3,893
Blind and Severely Hearing Impaired	4,999
Other Categories	839

Prevalence rates of deaf-blindness (a) are higher for females than for males, (b) are higher for older than younger age groups, (c) and vary widely from region to region in the United States.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Freeman (202) 245-0327

Program studies: Eugene Tucker (202) 245-8364

REHABILITATION SERVICES--PROJECTS WITH INDUSTRY
(CFDA No. 84.128)

Highlights:

- Evaluation Study completed (Section II.C below).
- One-time supplement of $5 million provided under Public Law 98-8, the Jobs Bill (Section II.C below)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 621 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$ 4,500,000
1980	"	5,500,000
1981	"	5,250,000
1982	$ 8,000,000	7,510,000
1983	8,000,000	13,000,000 1/

Purpose: To (1) provide handicapped individuals with training and experiences in a realistic work setting in order to prepare them for employment in the competitive market; (2) provide handicapped individuals with supportive services to permit them to continue to engage in the employment for which they have been trained; and (3) expand job opportunities for handicapped individuals by providing placement services, job development and modification, special aids, appliances, or work-site modifications which will permit employment of handicapped individuals.

Eligibility: Any public or private, profit or non-profit agency or organization able to provide training or employment for handicapped individuals, including private corporations, rehabilitation facilities, rehabilitation associations, educational institutions, labor unions, trade associations, and social service or other government agencies.

Applicant Requirements: FY 83 awards were made through a peer review process. Applications were evaluated according to criteria in EDGAP and published in 34 CFR 379.30. They are: (1) plan of operation (10 points); (2) quality of key personnel (10 points); (3) budget and cost effectiveness (5 points); (4) evaluation plan (5 points); (5) adequacy of resources (5 points); (6) achievement of competitive employment objectives (35 points); (7) coordination with service agencies (20 points); and (8) innovativeness of approach (10 points).

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Project support varies from 3 to 5 years. Projects are continued based on annual review of accomplishments and availability of funds.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: There is a 20 percent matching requirement. Annual fiscal reports are required, and progress reports must be submitted. Fiscal records must be maintained for the period of time specified in the grant award.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)(1)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objective for this program was as follows:

- Provide handicapped individuals with training and on-the-job experience in realistic work settings to prepare them for employment in the competitive market.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Staff estimate that approximately 12,000 placements of handicapped individuals will be accomplished with the FY 83 funds.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In FY 1983, 72 projects were supported to train and place in employment more than 10,000 handicapped individuals earning in excess of $50 million in wages from private sector employment. A one-time additional funding supplement of $5 million was provided to PWI under Public Law 98-8, the Jobs Bill. This allowed funding of 37 additional projects serving about 5000 more clients.

Types of services provided: Training was provided in settings such as commercial and industrial establishments, and supportive services were provided to handicapped clients.

Effectiveness: An assessment of the program completed in April 1983 (E.1) found that (1) PWI projects appear generally successful in meeting the program's goal of developing private sector linkages to assist disabled persons in achieving competitive employment, though quantitative information to verify the performance of specific projects is limited, and (2) no single type of organization is more successful than others in accomplishing PWI goals. Rather, the diversity of organizations operating PWIs and the flexibility of projects in providing services appear to be important factors in the PWI program's overall effectiveness.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation:

None.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Assessment of the Projects with Industry Program, Advanced Technology, Inc., McLean, Virginia and Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1983

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contact for further information:

Program operations: Wesley Geigel (202)245-1338

Program studies: Arthur Kirschenbaum (202) 245-8844

Notes

1. The $8 million regular appropriation was supplemented by a one time supplemental appropriation of $5 million under the Jobs Bill, thus total programs funds for FY 1983 were $13 million.

CENTERS FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING
(CFDA No. 84.132)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title VII, Part B, Section 711, Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112) as amended.

Funding Since 1979

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 80,000,000 1/	$ 2,000,000
1980	150,000,000	15,000,000
1981	200,000,000	18,000,000
1982	19,400,000 2/	17,280,000
1983	19,400,000 2/	19,400,000

Purpose: To provide independent living services to severely handicapped individuals to assist them to function more independently in family and community settings or to secure and maintain appropriate employment.

Eligibility: The principal eligible applicant for grants under this program is the designated State Unit which administers the Title I Vocational Rehabilitation Program (or units in States having one agency serving blind persons and one serving all other handicapped persons). If the designated State Unit or Units do not apply in any fiscal year within six months after the application date, applications may then be accepted from local public or private nonprofit agencies.

Applicant Requirements: There are no matching requirements. Handicapped persons must be involved in policy direction and management of Centers and must be employed by Centers.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: A Project period can be up to five years but the maximum awarded to date is 36 months. Projects may be continued based on review and availability of funds. Funds are awarded on an annual basis.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual fiscal reports are required and progress reports must be submitted as prescribed by grant award specifications.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were:

- To provide discretionary grants to establish and operate Centers for Independent Living -- facilities offering a combination of rehabilitation services in order that the severely handicapped may live more independently in family or community settings, or may be better able to secure and maintain employment.

- To promote substantial involvement of handicapped persons in policy direction and management of established Centers, and to promote employment of handicapped persons in the Centers.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In Fiscal Year 1983, the fourth year of operation of this program, awards have been made to 74 grantees for operation in FY 84. Grantee types are:

  42 general State agencies
  19 local organizations
  9 State agencies for the blind
  4 joint applications by general and blind agencies.

  Forty-two of the State units have contracted with local private non-profit agencies to operate Centers; 156 sites receive support through this program.

- Evaluability Assessment findings show that staff in Centers are predominantly disabled, and that program beneficiaries are involved in policy direction and management of established Centers.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits Provided: Grants average $250,000. Continuation applications show that most projects have developed services specified in the legislation. Many local sites focus on a single disability, for example, mental retardation, impaired mobility, or physical disability. Centers have initiated direct services to clients or referrals of clients to other agencies, and are working to influence local communities to promote awareness of handicapped special needs, and to provide curb cuts and accessible housing and transportation.

Program Effectiveness: An Evaluability Assessment of this program found that all projects were operational, with substantial agreement on program goals. Further potential exists for Centers to provide information to the Department and to develop information sharing systems. No national evaluation system exists, but most projects are developing local evaluation systems.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

There are no plans for legislative recommendations at this time.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. "Evaluability Assessment of Centers for Independent Living Program," American Institute for Research, September, 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies relating to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert E. Jones, (202) 245-0757

Program studies: Eugene Tucker, (202) 245-8364

Notes

1/ Authorization, 1979 to 1981, covers all of Title VII.
2/ Authorization for Part B only.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--BASIC GRANTS TO STATES
(CFDA No. 84.048, 84.051)

Highlights:

- Secretary Bell transmits Vocational and Adult Consolidation Bill. (II.D)
- Secretary Bell transmits Annual Vocational Education Report to Congress. (II.D)
- OVAE goals are defined to support Secretary's Initiatives (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, 20 U.S.C. 2301 to 2461; 90 Stat. 2168-2213.

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1979	$1,030,000,000	$587,947,518
1980	1,180,000,000	686,045,732
1981	1,325,000,000	612,082,728
1982	2/	587,736,648
1983	2/	657,902,898

Purpose: To assist States in improving planning and in conducting vocational education programs on the local level for persons of all ages who desire and need education and training for employment.

Eligibility: State Boards for Vocational Education are eligible for formula grants by establishing a State Advisory Council and certifying a five-year State plan, annual program plans and accountability reports. Governors, or their designated plan review agencies, must be given an opportunity to review plans. State grant formulas are based on the number of persons in specific age groups (15 to 19, 20 to 24, 25 to 65) and other requirements such as the quotient obtained by dividing the per capita income for the State by the per capita income of all States.

Applicant Requirements: States must give priority to economically depressed areas and areas with high unemployment rates and to programs which meet new and emerging employment needs. Each State must use $50,000 of its Basic Grant funds to support the activities of a full-time sex equity coordinator. In addition, with its funds for Basic Grants and Program Improvement and Supportive Services, each State must use at least 20 percent for services for the disadvantaged and limited-English-speaking, 15 percent for postsecondary and adult programs, and 10 percent for services for the handicapped. At the Federal level, one percent of the total funds for Basic Grants and Program Improvement and Supportive Services is set aside for grants to Indian tribal organizations for vocational training.

Applicant Requirements (Continued)

In addition to the mandated uses stated above, Basic Grants funds may be used for the following purposes: vocational training in a wide range of occupational areas, energy education, displaced homemaker programs, construction of area vocational facilities, contracts with private vocational training institutions, cooperative education, work-study programs, industrial arts, day care, support services for women, construction and operation of residential vocational facilities, State and local administration of vocational education, placement services, and stipends to students.

Program improvement grants assist States in upgrading and expanding their vocational programs and providing support services. Funding categories include: research programs; exemplary and innovative programs; curriculum development; guidance and counseling services; pre-and in-service training; grants to overcome sex bias; and costs of State and local administration of vocational education programs.

Preapplication Coordination: Five-year State plans, annual program plans and accountability report must be prepared with the active participation of representatives of 10 agencies, councils and individuals and consultation with the State Advisory Council. Plans are subject to public hearings.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: After the Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education approves five-year State plan, annual program plan and accountability report, a formal notification of award is sent to the State Board upon availability of funds. Grants are for a fiscal year. Funds, appropriated during any fiscal year which are not obligated or expended prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year, shall remain available for obligation and expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year.

Requirements of Grant Recipients: Annual accountability reports, Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) reports and OCR annual compliance reports; continuous evaluation (each program once each five years by State Board and annual evaluation by the State Advisory Council), and periodic audits and records as required are among the obligations of grant recipients.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Three goals have been defined to support the Secretary's goal of Strengthening Education for Work. These include:
  1. To increase the responsiveness of vocational and adult education to the Nation's defense preparedness.
  2. To introduce entrepreneurship education and training in all vocational and adult education programs, at all government and academic levels.

Goals and Objectives (Continued)

3. To increase the responsiveness of vocational and adult education to enhance the training needs of the workforce through educational technology.

° To fulfill Section 112 (c) requirements by submitting an annual report to Congress.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

° Three task forces were established to undertake various activities for each of the three programmatic goals.

° The Annual Vocational Education Report by the Secretary to the Congress 1982 was submitted to Congress on July 1, 1983.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Using the most recent data from VEDS, the report to Congress highlights the following:

Students served: Nationwide, about 16.8 million students were served in vocational education in school year 1980-81, including nearly 10.5 million secondary and 6.4 million postsecondary and adult students.

During school year 1980-81, vocational education served 555,961 handicapped students, or 3.3 percent of the total vocational enrollment. The number of disadvantaged vocational education students receiving supportive services in 1980-81 increased to over 2.5 million or more than 15 percent of the total enrollment.

Types of Services Provided: A series of quick-start economic development programs were organized in 20 States and Puerto Rico. They are primarily State-funded and designed to assist new and expanding industries. An estimated $28 million was targeted to serve an estimated 110,000 persons. Of these, 60,000 trainees were in Ohio.

Budget justification documents report that Basic Grants funds have been used to develop and implement programs in new and emerging occupations or in areas of critical skill shortage. Among the most popular of these fields are occupations related to computers, energy exploration and development, and high technology. Many States also use Basic Grants funds for replacing outdated materials and equipment.

States have used their Program Improvement and Supportive Services funds for such activities as developing materials to promote sex equity in vocational education, innovative career counseling programs, in-service training and professional development for instructors and administrators, development of vocational programs in new and emerging occupations and applied research.

Applicant Requirements (Continued)

In addition to the mandated uses stated above, Basic Grants funds may be used for the following purposes: vocational training in a wide range of occupational areas, energy education, displaced homemaker programs, construction of area vocational facilities, contracts with private vocational training institutions, cooperative education, work-study programs, industrial arts, day care, support services for women, construction and operation of residential vocational facilities, State and local administration of vocational education, placement services, and stipends to students.

Program improvement grants assist States in upgrading and expanding their vocational programs and providing support services. Funding categories include: research programs; exemplary and innovative programs; curriculum development; guidance and counseling services; pre-and in-service training; grants to overcome sex bias; and costs of State and local administration of vocational education programs.

Preapplication Coordination: Five-year State plans, annual program plans and accountability report must be prepared with the active participation of representatives of 10 agencies, councils and individuals and consultation with the State Advisory Council. Plans are subject to public hearings.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: After the Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education approves five-year State plan, annual program plan and accountability report, a formal notification of award is sent to the State Board upon availability of funds. Grants are for a fiscal year. Funds, appropriated during any fiscal year which are not obligated or expended prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year, shall remain available for obligation and expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year.

Requirements of Grant Recipients: Annual accountability reports, Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) reports and OCR annual compliance reports; continuous evaluation (each program once each five years by State Board and annual evaluation by the State Advisory Council), and periodic audits and records as required are among the obligations of grant recipients.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Three goals have been defined to support the Secretary's goal of Strengthening Education for Work. These include:

  1. To increase the responsiveness of vocational and adult education to the Nation's defense preparedness.

  2. To introduce entrepreneurship education and training in all vocational and adult education programs, at all government and academic levels.

Goals and Objectives (Continued)

3. To increase the responsiveness of vocational and adult education to enhance the training needs of the workforce through educational technology.

- To fulfill Section 112 (c) requirements by submitting an annual report to Congress.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Three task forces were established to undertake various activities for each of the three programmatic goals.
- The Annual Vocational Education Report by the Secretary to the Congress 1982 was submitted to Congress on July 1, 1983.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Using the most recent data from VEDS, the report to Congress highlights the following:

Students served: Nationwide, about 16.8 million students were served in vocational education in school year 1980-81, including nearly 10.5 million secondary and 6.4 million postsecondary and adult students.

During school year 1980-81, vocational education served 555,961 handicapped students, or 3.3 percent of the total vocational enrollment. The number of disadvantaged vocational education students receiving supportive services in 1980-81 increased to over 2.5 million or more than 15 percent of the total enrollment.

Types of Services Provided: A series of quick-start economic development programs were organized in 20 States and Puerto Rico. They are primarily State-funded and designed to assist new and expanding industries. An estimated $28 million was targeted to serve an estimated 110,000 persons. Of these, 60,000 trainees were in Ohio.

Budget justification documents report that Basic Grants funds have been used to develop and implement programs in new and emerging occupations or in areas of critical skill shortage. Among the most popular of these fields are occupations related to computers, energy exploration and development, and high technology. Many States also use Basic Grants funds for replacing outdated materials and equipment.

States have used their Program Improvement and Supportive Services funds for such activities as developing materials to promote sex equity in vocational education, innovative career counseling programs, in-service training and professional development for instructors and administrators, development of vocational programs in new and emerging occupations and applied research.

Program Effectiveness: The League of Women Voters Education Fund conducted an 18-month study in five States on State and local implementation of the sex equity provisions of VEA. The Fund published findings in 1982 and concluded that sex equity in vocational education has been progressing slowly but steadily. State reports indicate that in 1980-81, $9.9 million from Federal money was spent in activities to support sex equity and $2 million came from State and local funds.

The NIE study completed in 1981 addresses program effectiveness in some depth. Highlights of its findings include:

Strengthening Evaluations: Federal legislation has stimulated State and local evaluation activities. However, statutory evaluation requirements using the criteria of student placement and employer judgments of a student's training and preparation for employment are not generally useful for improving programs. These criteria have generated the collection of data of dubious validity and reliability.

Effects of Vocational Education on Participants: Results from research provide only a partial view of economic benefits to individuals and the possible effects of their vocational education experiences on those outcomes. Females who graduate from high school business and office programs have higher earnings, greater likelihood of finding jobs and higher occupational status than female graduates of secondary general curriculum. Differences in economic outcome between male secondary vocational and general curriculum graduates, who have no postsecondary education, are not as strong as those for females. High school graduates who pursue postsecondary education below the baccalaureate level do better on a variety of measures of gainful employment than those who do not. This summary from the NIE report is based on data from available surveys and is limited by the difficulty of attributing the attainments of students to particular educational experiences.

Other evaluations of Vocational Education programs have been reported in Annual Evaluation reports for fiscal years 1974-1982.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In April 1983, Secretary Bell forwarded to Congress a bill for the consolidation of Federal programs assisting vocational and adult education. The bill consolidated the existing vocational and adult education authorities into a single program of grants to the States, reduced administrative burden, increased State and local flexibility over the use of funds, and redirected Federal support to focus on vocational and adult education for local, State and national economic development. 3/

Part A, General Provisions, was a simplification of the current VEA. At least 95 percent of all funds were to be made available to the States; up to 5 percent was to be reserved for national programs. A Proposed Use Report, replacing the existing plans, evaluations, and reports, was to be required of each State on an annual basis. The report was a simple explanation of

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation (Continued)

proposed objectives, activities to be supported, allocations of funds, and other basic assurances and descriptions. The existing VEA formula for State allotments (based on population and inverse per capita income) was to be modified to include an unemployment factor, target more heavily on older populations, and eliminate constraints on the income factor. The existing national advisory councils on adult education and vocational education were replaced by a single national advisory council.

In Part B, States were required to use at least 30 percent of their grant money for programs and projects specifically related to State and local economic development. In addition, the States were required to use at least 30 percent of their funds for strengthening State and local systems of vocational education. The Bill also required that States use at least 15 percent of the funds they receive under Subpart 2 (Strengthening State and Local Systems of Vocational Education) to meet the needs of the handicapped. Emphases were on sex equity activities and retraining displaced workers. Thirteen percent of the grant was to be used for Adult Education.

This bill responded to the criticism that VEA is trying to do too much and has too little overall theme or purpose. This criticism is most recently found in the reports by the NIE Vocational Education Study and the National Commission on Employment Policy. (E-1,2)

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section D Above:

The Vocational Education Study. The Final Report. Publication 8. The National Institute of Education, September 1981.

The Federal Role in Education. National Commission for Employment Policy, September 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data:

VEDS data reporting race and ethnicity are incomplete and NCES is continuing effort to improve the quality of the data.

Number and percent change in reported total enrollment in vocational education (VEA) by institutional level: 50 States and D.C., 1979-80 to 1980-81

Institutional level	Number in thousands 1979-80*	Number in thousands 1980-81	Percent change 1979-80 to 1980-81
Total	16,453	16,862	+2.5
Secondary	10,082	10,466	+3.8
Postsecondary			
Total	6,371	6,396	+0.4
Regionally accredited institutions	4,196	4,123	-1.7
State approved institutions	474	449	-5.3
Other institution	1,702	1,824	+7.2

* Revised from earlier published figures.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Vocational Education Data System.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No other major studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: LeRoy Cornelson, (202) 472-3440

Program Studies: Dorothy Shuler (202) 245-8364

Notes:

1. These amounts include the permanent authorization of $6.7 million apportioned to the States each year under the Smith-Hughes Act. Includes basic grants and budget for program improvement and supportive services, under P.L. 94-482.

2. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not break out authorization by program.

3. Secretary Bell's transmittal letter to Congress on the Vocational and Adult Consolidation Bill, April 11, 1983.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(CFDA No. 84.052)

Highlights:

- Secretary Bell proposes bill to consolidate Federal programs assisting vocational education. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). 20.U.S.C. 2370. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$40,000,000	$20,000,000
1980	45,000,000	20,000,000
1981	50,000,000	14,954,000
1982	1/	14,356,000
1983	1/	14,356,000

Purpose: To provide special vocational education programs for persons who have academic, or economic handicaps and who require special services, assistance or programs in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs.

Eligibility: State Boards of Vocational Education are eligible to receive formula grants with the establishment of an overall State Vocational Advisory Council and certification of five-year State plan, annual program plan and accountability report by the State Board for Vocational Education. Governors or their designated Plan review agencies must be given an opportunity to review the State Plan.

Application and Award Process: Same as that for Basic Grants to States, Chapter 401. Unlike the Basic Grant, this authority does not have matching funds provisions.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

1. To simplify grant process and reduce burden on State agencies within the limits of the legislation.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

1. Regulations have been reviewed and changes recommended as allowable under the Act.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Effectiveness: Completion rates for students served by these special programs have usually been over 50 percent with comparable rates of employment or progression into additional training and education. A perceived accomplishment which has not been statistically established, is that these services and programs have been effective in preventing students from dropping out of school while providing them with needed basic and occupational skills. (2)

Persons served: In 1980-1981, the most recent year for which enrollment data are available, an estimated 140,000 disadvantaged persons were served. The special resources for the disadvantaged are intended to provide academically and economically disadvantaged persons with additional services they need to succeed in regular vocational programs. The academically disadvantaged clientele include those who have problems reading, writing, or computing, those with limited-English-proficiency, and those with a variety of other problems. The economically disadvantaged include the unemployed, those on public assistance and residents of correctional or other institutions. (3)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In April 1983, the Department transmitted to Congress proposed legislation consolidating existing vocational and adult legislation. The guiding principles in developing this bill were: (1) to simplify, increase flexibility, and reduce program costs at all levels of government, and (2) to redirect Federal support to focus on the role of vocational and adult education in economic development. Guided by those principles, categorical programs such as Special Programs for the Disadvantaged are included in the consolidated authority. This proposal is in response to the criticism that current legislation lacks an overall theme or purpose and tries to do too much. 4/ This criticism is most recently found in reports by the NIE Vocational Education Study and the National Commission on Employment Policy. (E.1-2)

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section D Above:

1. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. Publication No. 8. The National Institute of Education, September 1981.

2. The Federal Role in Education. National Commission for Employment Policy, September 1981.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contact for further information

Program operation: LeRoy A. Cornelson, (202)472-3440

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler (202)245-8364

Notes

1. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not break out authorization by program.
2. Bepartmental Budget Justification for 1984.
3. Vocational Education, Report to Congress, 1982, p.40.
4. S. 1039. Vocational and Adult Consolidation Act of 1983.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--FORMULA GRANTS TO STATES FOR CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION (CFDA No. 84.049)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976, Subpart 5, Public Law 94-482; 20 U.S.C. 2301-2461; 90 Stat. 2168-2213. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 65,000,000	$43,497,000
1980	$ 75,000,000	$43,497,000
1981	$ 80,000,000	$30,347,000
1982	$735,000,000 1/	$29,133,000
1983	$735,000,000 1/	$31,633,000

Purpose: To assist States in providing programs and services in consumer and homemaking education, with emphasis on programs located in economically depressed areas or areas of high unemployment.

Special Statutory Emphases: The law encourages, but does not prescribe, programs in line with the following priorities.

- Eliminating sex stereotyping by encouraging participation of both males and females to prepare for combining the roles of homemakers and wage earners;
- Giving greater consideration to economic, social, and cultural conditions, especially in economically depressed areas;
- Encouraging outreach programs in communities for youth and adults, giving consideration to the special needs of such diverse groups as the aged, young children, school-age parents, single parents, handicapped persons, educationally disadvantaged persons, patients, and inmates.
- Emphasizing consumer education, management of resources, promotion of nutritional knowledge and food use, and parenthood education to meet current societal needs.

Eligible Recipients: State Boards for Vocational Education. Eligible recipients for subgrants are local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions. Beneficiaries are youth K-12, adults, and postsecondary students.

Formula: Formula is same as employed in the Basic Grant program (see Chapter 401).

Matching Requirements: States must match federal funds 50/50 except in economically depressed areas or areas of high unemployment where the federal share can be 90 percent.

Obligation of Funds: States must spend one-third of funds in economically depressed areas. Most other requirements are same as for Basic Grant program (see Chapter 401).

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Consistent with legislative priorities, in FY 1983 the program office issued additional guidance designed to:

- encourage participation of both males and females;
- encourage establishment of outreach programs; and
- emphasize Federal priorities such as consumer education; family living/parenthood education, nutrition education, and home management including management of resources.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The following observations indicate positive responses to legislative priorities:

- An increase in male participation, from 8 percent of the total enrollment in 1972 to 23 percent in 1981.
- Increased activity in developing curricula and teacher training focused on outreach programs.
- While traditional homemaking courses still account for the majority of enrollments, faster growth is occurring in priority areas.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In 1980-1981 3.2 million students were enrolled, according to the Vocational Education Data System (E.2).

Program Scope: Based on 1981 VEDS data, 19.5 percent of the students enrolled in vocational education are in consumer and homemaking education (E.2). The State grants ranged from California $3,782,125 which is the largest to Alaska $76,732 which is the smallest.

Service to Economically Depressed Areas: The law's targeting provisions are intended to give a priority to programs in needy areas. In 1981, over 1.3 million people of the 3.2 million participating were from economically depressed areas. The law's targeting provisions are intended to give a priority to programs in needy areas. In 1981, over 1.3 million people of the 3.2 million participating were from economically depressed areas. While the total enrollment decreased by 196,000 from 1980, the enrollment from the economically depressed areas increased by over 33,000. During 1981, the states and outlying territories spent 58 percent of their federal monies for persons in economically depressed areas (E.4).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Impact of Services on Participants: The NIE study (E.1) concluded that relatively little rigorous research has been conducted on the effects of C&HE programs on learners in terms of changes in knowledge, attitudes, or behavior. Some evidence (E.4) indicates that knowledge improves after students participate in consumer and homemaking education courses, particularly in the subject matter areas of child development and nutrition, but significant evidence that students' attitudes and behavior are affected is lacking.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

As with other programs currently authorized under VEA, consumer and homemaking education has been proposed for consolidation in the Vocational and Adult Education Consolidation Act. If the proposed legislation is enacted, States would be free to determine the share of funds that go to consumer and homemaking education.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. NIE, Washington, DC, 1981.
2. The Condition of Education: 1983 Edition. NCES, Washington, DC, 1983.
3. The Condition of Education: 1972 Edition. NCES, Washington, DC, 1972.
4. Vocational Education: Report by the Secretary of Education to the Congress 1982.
5. State Annual Accountability Reports for Vocational Education. Division of Vocational Education Services, Office for Vocational and Adult Education, ED, Washington, D.C.

F. Other Supporting Data

RACIAL/ETHNIC DESIGNATION AND SEX OF CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING PARTICIPANTS

	AMER. IND/ ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	BLACK NOT HISPANIC	HISPANIC	WHITE NOT HISPANIC	NOT-RESIDENT ALIEN	STATUS UNKNOWN	TOTAL
MALE	7,485	10,200	131,311	34,779	471,041	703		
FEMALE	23,886	28,965	390,047	103,292	1,699,448	5,210		
TOTAL	31,371	39,165	521,358	138,071	2,170,489	5,913	282,881	3,189,248

Source: Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) 1980-81 School Year

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress at the Federal level. States and universities are conducting research in cooperation with professional organizations and the private sector.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Bertha G. King, (202) 245-9786

Program Studies: Elaine Green, (202) 245-8877

Note

1. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act, but does not break out authorization by individual program.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--INDIAN TRIBES AND INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS
(CFDA No. 84.101)

Highlights:

- Secretary Bell proposes a bill to consolidate Federal vocational programs. (II.D)
- Secretary Bell proposes priority to improve job placement of trainees. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by Title II of the Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482). Title II; 20 U.S.C. 2303; 90 Stat. 2170.

Funding since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 10,030,000	$ 5,938,864
1980	11,800,000	6,938,864
1981	13,250,000	6,182,654
1982	2/	5,936,734
1983	2/	6,645,484

Purpose: To make grants and contracts to eligible Indian tribes and tribal organizations to plan, conduct, and administer programs or portions of programs authorized by and consistent with the Vocational Education Act. Tribes and Indian organizations may apply for grants for any programs, services and activities cited as eligible under Part 1, Subpart 2, Section 120 of the Act.

Eligibility: Indian tribes and tribal organizations which are eligible to contract with the Secretary of the Interior for the administration of programs under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 or under the Act of April 16, 1934.

Application and Award Process: Proposals must be prepared and submitted in accordance with program announcements. The technical review criteria as announced in the Federal Register are utilized in reviewing applications. These criteria are printed as a part of the formal program announcements. The Assistant Secretary for Vocational and Adult Education approves an application, and after negotiation is completed, the Department of Education Grants Officer sends the Notification of Award to the recipient.

Length and Time Phase of Assistance: An award may not exceed 3 years.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are due once a year as required in the grant award documents.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goal and Objectives

1. To improve the job placement record of trainees served under this authority.

B. Accomplishments

1. Annual Funding Priorities. In June, 1983, Secretary Bell proposed priorities for grants to be awarded during fiscal year 1984 that are intended to improve the job placement rate for Indian trainees. To qualify for priority points, applications must include: (a) the number of participants to be trained; (b) information that shows that the applicant has determined that jobs related to the types of training to be conducted are available; and (c) documentation from employers (which may include tribal councils) that trainees will be employed in jobs related to their training and related to tribal economic development. For applicants who have not previously received an award under this program, the minimum placement percentage is 50 percent of the trainees; for applicants who have previously received an award, the minimum percentage is 65 percent of the trainees.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Evaluation

Trainees: Over two thousand Indian trainees in 13 States are estimated as enrolled in vocational programs in the final year of continuation grants. Training is offered in a wide range of occupations including: public administration and business management, welding, clerical, auto mechanics, appliance repairs, heavy equipment operation, road building, construction, agriculture, carpentry and plumbing, bookkeeping and small business management. (E.1)

Costs: These vary widely with the smallest grant of $84,274 funding a counseling and work-study program for 196 students; and the largest grant funding vocational training through a consortium of community colleges serving four reservations in North Dakota with a planned enrollment of 621. Given the goal of providing a wide range of training programs for Indian students, some programs carry a high per-pupil cost because of the typically small number of students involved. For example, the Navajo program for training diesel mechanics, heavy equipment operators, and road builders served 15 adults at a cost of $206,310. This kind of expenditure was necessitated by the high cost of purchasing or renting the equipment needed. (E.1)

Effectiveness: Data indicate that placement rates for those programs designed for immediate trainee placement are in the 50 percent range. The target population served by these programs has a lengthy history of disadvantagement and high unemployment, however, and program staff report that placement rates have been slowly increasing. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Proposed Legislation. In April, 1983, Secretary Bell sent a bill to Congress to consolidate Federal programs assisting vocational and adult education. Part C, National Programs, would have authorized the national discretionary programs supported in the past, consolidating them under a single authority and giving them a new focus on economic development.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section D Above.

1. Project Summary: Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations. June 1983.
2. An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for Indian Tribes and Organizations. Communications Technology Corporation, November 1980.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contact for further information:

Program operations: David Leavitt or Harvey Thiel (202) 245-2774

Program studies: Dorothy Shuler (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. P.L. 94-482 authorizes a one percent set-aside of funds from Subparts 2 and 3 (basic grant and program improvement) to support Indian projects and one percent ($68,034) per year from the Smith-Hughes permanent authorization.

   Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-84 but does not breakout authorization by program.

2. Application for Grants under the Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION--PROGRAMS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE
(CFDA No. 84.051)

Highlights

- The first independent evaluation of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at the Ohio State University was completed (Section II.C below).
- The contract for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education was re-awarded to the Ohio State University. (II.B)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended by P.L. 94-482, Title II, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2. (Expires September 30, 1984.)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation 1/
1979	$ 51,500,000	$ 10,358,273
1980	59,000,000	10,358,073
1981	66,250,000	7,835,073
1982	-- 2/	8,536,073
1983	-- 2/	8,036,073

Purpose: To develop and disseminate improvements in vocational education, especially by providing Federal grant or contract funds for projects improving (a) vocational education services, (b) information on availability of services or employment, and (c) the relevance of job training and retraining.

Program Elements:

- National Center for Research in Vocational Education: NCRVE has served as a national focal point for State and regional program improvement and development efforts by engaging in analysis, applied studies, product development, and evaluation and by operating a clearinghouse for State and federally supported projects.
- National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee: NOICC (along with its State Occupational Information Coordination Committees [SOICCs]) assists students, educators, and occupational planners in estimating future labor market conditions by improving and disseminating job information. (Joint funding of NOICC comes from the Department of Labor.)
- Special Projects (including the six Curriculum Coordination Centers): The Special Projects funds are used to develop innovative curricula, training models, and products designed to respond to emerging needs in the field of vocational training. These products and materials are subsequently catalogued and disseminated to the States by the six regional Curriculum Coordination Centers.

Program Elements (Continued)

Applicant Eligibility: Only nonprofit agencies are eligible for the competition held every five years for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education (NCRVE). Public, nonprofit, and profit-making organizations and individuals are eligible for other PNS grants and contracts.

Award Restrictions: Grant and contract awards are restricted to projects meeting the definition of vocational education and demonstrating a reasonable probability of developing curriculum materials or improving teaching techniques that will be used in a substantial number of classrooms (or other learning situations) within five years after project termination.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives were to:

- Recompete the contracts for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education and two Curriculum Coordination Centers;
- Produce information for planning and policy development;
- Produce information through applied research and development for developing improved curriculum materials, to help States evaluate local programs, and for other purposes;
- Develop State and local leaders through conferences and workshops;
- Package and disseminate information; and
- Initiate new special projects to address new national needs.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

During FY 1983, major accomplishments were:

- NCRVE contract was recompeted and won for the second time by the Ohio State University; the contract can run five years, if option years are approved. Competitions were also held for two Curriculum Coordination Center contracts and were reawarded to the University of Hawaii (Western CCC) and to Mississippi State University (Southeast CCC).
- Twelve planning and policy studies were completed, including those addressing the following subjects:

  --Labor market outcomes of secondary vocational education;
  --Microcomputers in vocational education;
  --Education-to-work transition patterns;
  --Future implications for vocational education;
  --Use of occupational and labor market data.

Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

- Twenty-two applied R&D studies, including four evaluation products, were completed including:

  --Vocational education for gifted and talented students;
  --A vocational planning guide; and
  --Idea Book: Meeting the Needs of Disadvantaged Youth.

- NCRVE held 82 conferences and workshops in 24 States for 2,901 vocational education leaders and 26 leadership and training conferences for educators in postsecondary and adult vocational education; at its Advanced Study Center it hosted 4 post-doctoral fellows and 27 resident scholars. The six Curriculum Coordination Centers provided training and leadership development to the 57 State liaison representatives who, in turn, held 432 awareness sessions and 518 inservice training workshops for 65,278 people.

- Distribution was made by NCRVE of 6 "exemplary products," 10 synthesis papers, 7 interpretative papers, and more than 98,000 pieces of promotional materials. In addition 17 mailings were sent to 13,000 persons and 5 brochures were widely distributed.

  (The Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE) has also indicated that NCRVE "received and responded to 4,000 requests for information, in addition to providing technical assistance and advice to the hundreds of visitors who visit the Center each year.")

In addition, the NCRVE clearinghouse entered more than 900 State program improvement products into the Resources in Vocational Education data system. NOICC conducted four regional conferences for vocational education administrators and planners, co-sponsored by OVAE and NCES, introducing the Vocational Preparation and Occupations (VPO) Handbook and related unit analyses; prepared a planner's guide for SOICC directors and vocational educators; prepared and issued a training guide for SOICC directors to use in training vocational education and manpower training officials in the use of the VPO; and established a center for VPO data that can be accessed by all vocational educators and other users.

- Six new special projects on new national needs were initiated, including those on:

  --High technology: A Program of Work;
  --Standards for Excellence in Trade and Industrial Education;
  --Dissemination of Information About the Third Annual Secretary's Awards for Outstanding Programs; and
  --A computer teleconference on training and retraining.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Obligations: In FY 1983, obligations were:

National Center for Research in Vocational Education	$5,399,946
National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee	2,243,100
Special Projects	1,996,983
Curriculum Coordination Centers	(745,520)
TOTAL	$9,680,029

Evaluation of NCRVE Deliverables: The deliverables produced by the National Center for Research in Vocational Education of the Ohio State University were evaluated by a panel of nine nationally recognized authorities on education, training, and work (E.1). The panel raised seven broad questions about NCRVE deliverables:

- Are they responsive to Federal requirements?
- Who are they meant to assist?
- Do they provide useful assistance?
- Do they add to knowledge about vocational education?
- Do they exhibit high standards of quality?
- Are they likely to improve vocational education?
- What do they indicate about the management of the NCRVE program?

The panel reached the following conclusions 3/:

- Responsiveness: NCRVE has complied with Federal contractual requirements, but has not produced deliverables that adequately address the primary objective of Federal vocational education policy, namely, systematic improvement in the quality and effectiveness of vocational education services.

- Target Audiences: While NCRVE has addressed its research, development, and dissemination deliverables to many audiences, it has provided insufficient assistance to those who provide overall direction to vocational policy.

- Utility: Practicing vocational educators are likely to find many of NCRVE's products useful in dealing with routine operational problems, but other groups, especially policymakers, are not likely to find them very useful.

- Knowledge: NCRVE has helped to distribute research about vocational education, but it has added very little that is new to the existing fund of information.

- Quality: Although the editorial quality of NCRVE's written deliverables ranged from good to excellent, NCRVE's research generally lags behind the prevailing standards of excellence in the nation's best research institutions.

Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Improvement: The panel thought that many of NCRVE's products could be helpful in solving routine problems in vocational education, but the panel also concluded that they are unlikely to assist significantly in improving vocational education.
- Management: The panel concluded that NCRVE has been well-managed in routine administrative matters, but its written deliverables suggest that NCRVE has been less well-managed at a policy level.

(OVAE has indicated that "the number of NCRVE products and clients makes any comprehensive measure of its benefits difficult, (but) it has been shown that its products are not only widely used by every State in this nation but are utilized by many other nations, as well." In addition, OVAE notes that NCRVE's "clearinghouse, electronic newsletter, and message switching systems communicate rapidly with users; and its conferences and training for the 57 State Research Coordinating Directors, State Personnel Development Directors, and the six Curriculum Coordination Center Directors among others, have substantially expanded and enhanced the national network for program improvement in vocational education.")

Benefits from the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee: Since the major innovations made during fiscal year 1983 are so recent, results cannot yet be stated.

Benefits From Curriculum Coordination Centers: The Office of Vocational and Adult Education estimates that if all the CCC-disseminated curriculum materials adopted during FY 1982 had been separately developed at each of the using sites, nearly $4 million in costs would have been incurred (see E.2 below).

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration's proposed Vocational and Adult Education Consolidation Act includes a Federal set-aside for discretionary projects from which up to 5 percent of the total appropriation could be used. Projects similar to those now supported under PNS could be funded.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. An Evaluation of the National Center for Research in Vocational Education, the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio: A Report of an Expert Panel on Written Products Delivered Between January 1978 and January 1982, Technassociates, Inc., Rockville, Maryland, October 1982.

2. Curriculum Coordination Center Impact Report for 1982, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Department of Education, Washington, D.C., May 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations--Howard Hjelm, (202) 245-2278
Program Studies--Jay Noell, (202) 245-8638

Notes

1. Funds are appropriated for this activity on a "no-year" basis. They become available for obligation on July 1 of the fiscal year in which appropriated and remain available until expended. In addition, $358,073 (which remains available for only one year) is apportioned to this activity annually from the Smith-Hughes Act permanent appropriation. These Smith-Hughes funds are included in the totals shown.

2. Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 authorizes $735,000,000 for the Vocational Education Act for 1982-1984, but does not break out authorization by program.

3. The Advisory Council for the National Center for Research in Vocational Education at the Ohio State University, which advises the Secretary and the NCRVE Director, seriously questioned the methodology, the findings, and recommendations of the evaluation report. The Council's analysis of the evaluation report is available from the Department.

ADULT EDUCATION - STATE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.002)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230, as amended (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$210,000,000	$100,000,000
1980	230,000,000	100,000,000 1/
1981	250,000,000	100,000,000
1982	100,000,000	86,400,000
1983	100,000,000	95,000,000

Purpose: To expand educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will enable educationally disadvantaged adults to acquire basic skills necessary to function in society, to complete secondary school, and to profit from employment-related training.

Eligibility and Formula: States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico are allotted funds based on the proportion of their adult population who lack a secondary school certificate and are not enrolled in such schools, plus $150,000. Outlying territories are allotted one percent or less of the appropriated funds. The States and territories distribute funds to districts or other non-profit organizations based on State-run competitions.

Services Provided by Recipient Agencies: School districts or other agencies funded by the State provide basic skills or other services to persons 16 years of age or older who are not high school graduates and who need additional skills.

Applicant Requirements: To receive its allotment, a State must file a general State application and submit a State plan once every three years to the Department of Education.

Duration and Phasing of Activities: Funds allocated during any fiscal year which are not obligated or expended prior to the beginning of the next fiscal year remain available for obligation and expenditure for another year. States draw funds as needed under a Letter of Credit.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Each State is required to match Federal dollars at a rate of 10 cents for every 90 cents of Federal money received. (No match is required of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.) All grantees must use at least ten percent of their grants for special projects and teacher training.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: (Continued)

The State Grants also support programs for adults of limited English proficiency and for residents of rural and urban areas with high unemployment rates.

Annual financial and performance reports are required of each grant recipient as well as the maintenance of records for audits.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1982 the Department's principal objectives for this program were:

1. To improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program;
2. To disseminate information on effective practices;
3. To improve service delivery to program participants;
4. To study ways of reducing the adult illiteracy problem.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

1. State educational agencies are using a broad array of agencies to improve and expand the outreach capacity of the program. Fiscal year 1981 reports from the States indicated an average of 635 agencies, organizations, and institutions per State were used to provide adult education and support services. Business and Industry led as providers of services, followed by churches, local educational agencies, voluntary/community organizations, and manpower/training agencies. Support services include transportation for adult education participants and child care. For these two services, many entities served as providers, with churches being the most common.

2. The Clearinghouse on Adult Education has as one of its main functions the dissemination of information on effective practices. Five adult education projects have been approved by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel for their replicability and positive impact on participants.

   Networks have been established in support of competency-based adult education, adult secondary education, English as a second language, education for adults with disabilities, and defense-related adult education. These networks help build State and local capacity for enhancing the quality of adult education.

3. The delivery of adult education services has been changed through the provision of support services, flexible scheduling, convenient locations for classes, and the use of instructional materials and methodologies more appropriate to the education of adults. These program improvements make it possible to better serve adults and to upgrade their educational, economic, and social status.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

4. A small scale study has been started (a) to identify educational needs of adults, (b) to obtain baseline data in response to the Secretary's adult literacy initiative, and (3) to assess the service delivery system of the program to meet specific target populations.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The distribution of the fiscal year 1982 monies for use in fiscal year 1983 was as follows: (1) $864,000 received by Outlying Areas; (2) each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico received a minimum amount of $150,000; and (3) the remainder was distributed on the basis of the number of persons 16 and over with less than a high school education based on the 1970 Census. Thirty States had grants of more than $1 million with the four largest being New York ($7,126,494), California ($6,307,189), Pennsylvania ($4,813,015), and Texas ($4,710,912). The smallest State amount was $226,766 granted to Alaska.

In fiscal year 1983 over 2 million adults participated in the program at an average Federal expenditure of approximately $42 per person. About 20 percent received instruction in English as a second language.

States reported major involvement in adult education and support services by business and industry, churches, local educational agencies, and voluntary/community organizations.

States continued efforts to improve the quality of instructional services through special experimental demonstration projects and teacher training projects. Projects trained personnel -- administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals. Program areas of major investment for special projects include learning for the disabled, high school diploma, English as a second language, adult performance level/life skills, and community linkages.

Type of Benefits Provided: The majority or Federal funds are expended on various types of instructional activities through grants made by the States to projects at the local level. All States are required to place emphasis on adult basic education programs. Instruction in English as a second language is also a priority of the legislation.

Program Effectiveness: Federal program staff have summarized State performance reports. They state that:

- The majority of the participants in the program are in grades 0-8 or ESL.
- Over 81 percent of the participants are between 16 and 44 years of age.
- Almost 80 percent of the participants indicated that they had achieved their individual program goals.

Program Effectiveness: (Continued)

- States report that those benefitting from adult education, support services, and associated personnel development efforts included priority groups such as adults with limited English proficiency, adults in rural areas, adults in urban areas with high rates of unemployment, and immigrant adults; and personnel such as administrators, supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Proposals were introduced in the Congress to consolidate the Adult Education Act and the Vocational Education Act.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

The source of information presented in Section C is the State reports required by regulation to be submitted to the Department of Education each year.

F. Other Supporting Data: No national studies in these areas were conducted during fiscal year 1983. In addition, collection of demographic data from the States has not been permitted subsequent to 1981. Using the most recent data, 1981 State reports provide the following information:

Total number of participants		2,261,252
American Indian & Native Alaskans	20,519	
Asian and Pacific Islanders	235,675	
Black	501,973	
Hispanic	507,889	
White	955,196	
Participants By Level		(2,261,252)
Level I participants (grades 0-8 and ESL)	1,607,092	
Level II participants (grades 9-12)	654,160	
Participants By Age		(2,261,252)
Age 16-24 years	956,680	
25-44	886,836	
45-59	270,935	
60+	146,801	

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 407 (b):

A small-scale study is being planned for fiscal year 1984.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program operations: Paul V. Delker (202) 245-9793

Program studies: Eugene Tucker (202) 245-8364

Notes

1. In fiscal year 1980, a supplemental appropriation contained $5,000,000 for two discretionary programs: (a) Adult Immigrants; and (b) Adult Indochina Refugees. An additional 17.6 million was made available for adult education for Cuban and Haitian entrants. These programs were operated during 1981-82.

OFFICE OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PELL (BASIC EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY) GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.063)

Highlights

- The number of Pell applicants was about the same as in the previous year. (IIC)
- Low-income freshman students met approximately one fourth of their educational expenses through the Pell grant program. (IIC)
- No sexual bias was observed in the distribution of funds through this program. (IIF)
- The participation rate for Black students was 72 percent higher than for white students.
- From 1980 to 1982 program participation rates for freshmen declined. (IIC)
- Significant improvements were made in the timeliness of processing applications during 1982-83. (IIB)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Education Amendments of 1972, Title IV; PL. 92-318, 86 Stat., 247-251; as amended PL. 94-328, PL. 94-482, PL. 95-43, PL. 95-566 and PL. 96-374, PL. 97.35, PL. 97-301 (expires Sept. 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$2,431,000,000[1]
1980	"	2,157,000,000[1]
1981	"	2,604,000,000[2]
1982	2,600,000,000	2,419,040,000
1983	2,800,000,000	2,419,040,000

Purpose: Provide assistance to qualified students to help meet their costs of undergraduate education at eligible institutions of higher education. The program is intended to improve access to postsecondary education for students demonstrating financial need.

Eligibility: Eligibility for Pell Grants is limited to undergraduate students, enrolled in an eligible institution and program of postsecondary education, who are maintaining "satisfactory progress" and attend on at least a half-time basis. Students must demonstrate financial need as determined by the schedule of expected family contribution published annually by the Secretary in the Federal Register and must not receive a family contribution of more than $1599.

Application Procedure: A student submits an application to a processor under contract to the Department of Education. The processor calculates the student's expected family contribution from the contribution schedule, determines the student's eligibility and notifies the student. The eligibility notice is then submitted to the institution designated by the student. An award amount is determined by the school based on schedules drawn up by the Department of Education for various levels of family contribution and cost of education to attend that school.

Award Procedure: Generally, institutions act as disbursing agents under agreement with the Department of Education. Awards are payable to the institution by the Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA) based on the submission by the institution of a student aid roster showing the amount of grant aid expected for all students enrolling in the coming academic period (year or semester). Institutions not choosing to act as disbursement agents may verify a student's eligibility and award calculation and the grant will be paid directly to the student by OSFA.

In 1981-82, the maximum Pell award was $1670 and the minimum and maximum were $50 and $1800 respectively.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The deadline for application submission was March 15, 1981, for the 1981-82 academic year grants. For academic year 1982-83 the application deadline was April 1, 1982 and for 1983-84 it was May 1, 1983. Awards are available to students for the period required to complete the first baccalaureate degree (or equivalent) with no limit on the number of grants per student. However, the student must be attending at least half-time and must be making satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate degree; therefore, there is an implied limit on the number of grants to each recipient.

Requirements During Assistance: If the student fails to maintain satisfactory progress or eligibility the grant is reclaimed from the institution by the Federal government. The payments to and reclamations from institutions are reconciled by the Office of Student Financial Assistance at the end of the award year.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

The goal of the Pell Grant program is to provide access to higher education to persons who may otherwise be denied access because of financial need. Departmental objectives to meet this goal in the 1982-83 academic year were:

- Establish a standard of need analysis and distribute this information to institutions and students.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- Employ an application system which does not unduly burden applicants with complex forms and untimely delays.
- Monitor and control inaccurate or inappropriate information leading to disbursement of over/under awards.
- Maintain equitable distribution of aid, and maintain access to higher education for students in low-income families.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Addressing the goals and objectives of this program, the Office of Student Financial Assistance (OSFA) has accomplished the following during 1982-83.

- Pell application forms reflecting Federal laws and regulations governing the calculation of expected family contribution were prepared and distributed.
- The new processing contractor (SDC) processed applications from approximately 5,000,000 students in 1982-83 and produced eligibility reports in an effective and timely manner.
- Quality control studies were made to determine the principal sources of error in application data and award calculation. The studies showed that verification of applicant data could reduce over award problems and avoid under awards by simplifying application forms and establishing patterns of responses requiring verification.
- Low income students were able to attend college at enrollment rates more comparable to higher income individuals than in previous years.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Students Served: Preliminary tabulations for the 1982-83 award year show that the number of applications declined only slightly to 5,118,543, but that there was an increase in valid applications. The number of eligible applicants also declined to 3,327,000. Complete data is not yet available on the actual number of recipients and the size of awards. However, in the 1981-82 award year for Pell Grants, 4,883,071 students submitted applications of which 4,615,000 were valid (contained all required information) and 3,336,961 were qualified (had a demonstrable family need). The recipients from this group totaled 2,709,000. Total grants of $2,309,056,000 were distributed, averaging $849 per recipient, with a range from $50 to $1670 (E.1). A detailed breakdown of first-time fulltime students served by cost of college and family income is presented below in Tables 1 and 2 in the section on program effectiveness.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Institutions Participating: In 1981-82 4915 institutions acted as disbursing agents for Pell grants and 787 requested OSFA to be the disbursing agent. These numbers did not change radically from 1981 to 1982. (E.1)

Type of Benefits Provided: The Pell grant provides a basic floor of financial aid which, together with family contribution, work/loan and other non-federal aid programs, enables access to higher education at the undergraduate level. Approximately 50% of college students received some form of Federal financial aid in 1982-83 of which Pell Grants were a substantial portion (E.2, E.3).

Program Effectiveness: Two questions address program effectiveness: (1) How well does the Pell Grant Program provide a "floor of support" for postsecondary students? (2) Are these funds distributed in an equitable manner, i.e., are they income and cost sensitive? The data in Table 1 (E.2) address the answers to these questions.

For 1982-83, the support for first-time full-time freshman provided by Pell grants is shown in Table 1 (E.2).

Pell grants provide freshmen with a floor of support which meets a larger percentage of total costs at lower cost schools than higher cost schools (26.4 percent vs. 12.9 percent) (E.2). For the low-income population (family income under $10000) Pell grants provide even more support for the lower cost schools, e.g., 26.4% of costs in the $0-3000 cost range for all incomes but 30.4% of costs in this range for the lowest income students. It can be seen that Pell grants are responsive to income and school costs. Grant amounts increase as costs increase but, with one exception, decrease at progressively higher levels of family income. However, the percent of costs covered by Pell (averaged over first-time full-time freshmen) actually declines with increasing cost (26.4% at $0-3000 to 12.9% at $6001 and above), although the size of the grant does increase ($748 at $0-3000 to $887 at $6001 and above).

The change in Pell distribution over the period 1980-82 is shown by comparing Table 1 with Table 2 for 1980-81 (E.4).

Table 1

PELL GRANTS TO STUDENTS, Fall 1982

---FAMILY INCOME---

Cost of Education ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	853.	794.	617.	590.	594.	748.
	% AID	50.79	40.20	20.48	9.96	6.46	24.95
	RATIO	30.39	28.10	21.73	20.70	20.95	26.41
3001-4000	AVG $	1006.	806.	644.	660.	760.	813.
	% AID	52.36	39.81	18.92	8.58	4.06	22.32
	RATIO	28.22	22.52	17.97	18.36	21.06	22.65
4001-5000	AVG $	1061.	825.	625.	644.	819.	812.
	% AID	62.15	49.27	23.72	10.20	4.13	24.03
	RATIO	24.00	18.72	14.18	14.56	18.46	18.37
5001-6000	AVG $	1145.	872.	701.	759.	775.	878.
	% AID	64.13	48.36	22.80	9.58	3.95	23.95
	RATIO	21.64	16.53	13.32	14.38	14.60	16.63
6001+	AVG $	1321.	1084.	961.	1062.	1138.	1099.
	% AID	71.02	58.23	33.41	16.73	6.27	26.31
	RATIO	16.86	13.50	11.78	12.61	12.53	12.91
TOTAL	AVG $	1094.	881.	727.	789.	917.	887.
	% AID	59.66	47.07	23.63	10.88	4.85	24.10
	RATIO	23.35	18.28	14.81	15.54	15.81	17.28

Data Base= First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = % of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

Source: E.2

Table 2

PELL GRANTS TO STUDENTS, Fall 1980

---FAMILY INCOME---

Cost of Education ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG	934.	749.	577.	589.	813.	772.
	% AID	66.40	46.39	24.69	11.17	5.30	33.94
	RATIO	36.71	27.99	21.27	21.57	29.61	28.82
3001-4000	AVG	1039.	803.	594.	629.	746.	802.
	% AID	67.63	49.48	25.79	10.75	4.47	29.83
	RATIO	30.45	23.40	17.26	18.28	21.52	23.30
4001-5000	AVG	1108.	888.	627.	694.	672.	865.
	% AID	70.87	53.96	30.40	13.08	6.15	34.87
	RATIO	24.27	19.38	13.70	15.19	14.71	18.90
5001-6000	AVG	1002.	813.	651.	749.	810.	817.
	% AID	61.03	50.53	29.61	13.35	6.41	34.63
	RATIO	19.01	15.37	12.26	14.06	15.10	15.39
6001+	AVG	1249.	999.	814.	857.	961.	982.
	% AID	73.37	58.46	34.67	15.94	5.68	30.68
	RATIO	17.73	13.96	11.20	11.46	12.44	13.27
TOTAL	AVG	1029.	828.	636.	690.	808.	828.
	% AID	67.03	50.42	27.73	12.21	5.30	32.23
	RATIO	26.47	20.19	15.34	16.17	17.25	19.65

Data Base = First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = % of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

SOURCE: E.4

C. Costs, Benefits and Program Effectiveness: (Continued)

From 1980 to 1982 period, average dollar amounts of freshman grants increased and were applied at higher cost schools. However, fewer freshmen received the grants (24.1% aided in 1982-83 vs. 32.2% aided in 1980-81).

Pell Grants appear to be equitably distributed as indicated by data in Tables 1 and 2, with grant amounts decreasing with income but increasing with cost. Pell amounts, as a percent of cost and as a rate of program participation, are highest for low-income students, which appears to be consistent with legislative intent.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The administration wants to place the emphasis on parental and student contribution as the basis of meeting college costs before Federal student aid is considered. Currently, a student calculates the amount of Federal aid obtainable such as grants, low-cost loans and work-study funds and then looks to parent or self-help for additional funds. Under the new proposal, family contribution and self-help would come first. Students would be required to provide a maximum of 40 percent, or a minimum of $800 toward their educational expenses through work or loans before qualifying for any grants. The family would continue to be expected to contribute support.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, "Pell Grant Program 1981-82 End-of-year Report", compiled by OSFA.

2. Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1982-83, tables derived by Planning and Evaluation Service of ED.

3. "Student Financial Aid for Full-time Undergraduates, Fall 1982", Survey H60, Higher Education Panel, C. Anderson and F. Atelsek, Washington, D.C., unpublished.

4. Cooperative Institutional Research Program of Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81, tables derived by Planning and Evaluation Service of ED.

5. Personal communication with Office of Program Operations, Sept. 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data

The distribution of Pell grants to freshmen by race and sex is shown in Table 3 below (E.2) for the 1982-83 award year. The difference in participation rates and mean award rates between men and women is not great. In general, the participation rates of blacks were higher for black students than for white students. Award levels varied across the income groups in the table.

Table 3

PARTICIPATION IN THE PELL PROGRAM
BY SEX AND RACE FOR FIRST TIME, FULL TIME
DEPENDENT STUDENTS FALL 1982

Family Income	$1- 5,999	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,000	$40,000 AND UP	All
Male						
% Participating	57.6	53.8	33.5	13.5	5.0	22.8
Average Per Recipient	$1,176	$1,016	$ 796	$ 801	$963	$913
Female						
% Participating	61.9	53.2	34.7	13.5	4.6	25.5
Average Per Recipient	$1,107	$ 970	$ 754	$ 740	$881	$880
Black						
% Participating	69.4	75.3	37.0	21.0	10.8	41.7
Average Per Recipient	$1,074	$ 956	$ 860	$ 858	$996	$939
White						
% Participating	59.9	53.1	34.0	13.7	4.8	24.2
Average Per Recipient	$1,135	$ 986	$ 773	$ 771	$932	$893
All Students						
% Participating	60.1	53.5	34.1	13.5	4.8	24.1
Average Per Recipient	$1,135	$ 991	$ 775	$ 772	$927	$896

SOURCE: E.2

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 above provides annual data on the distribution of aid for Federal student aid programs for first-time full-time dependent freshman students. Data for the 1983-84 academic year will be available during Spring 1984.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Joseph A. Vignone, (202) 472-4300

Program studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Excess monies in FY78 and FY79 were carried forward. $140,000,000 was rescinded. $258,000,000 was drawdown from FY81.

2. Includes $150,000,000 reduction due to Budget Amendment. Includes Supplemental appropriation. Of this amount, $258,000,000 was drawdown for FY80.

3. Under the regular disbursement system, funds are distributed to the school by the Department of Education. Under the alternate system, schools certify the student eligibility and funds are distributed directly to the student.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.007)

Highlights:

- The percentage of first-time full-time freshmen recipients decreased from 1980-81 to 1982-83 while average awards increased. (II.C)
- The number of participating institutions increased to about 4200. (II.B)
- Distribution of funds to students within states based on actual need is not highly correlated with distribution of funds to states by means of the state allocation formula. (II.C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329; Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2; 20 U.S.C. 1070b, Public Laws 92-318, 94-482, 95-566, 96-374, and 97-12.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$200,000,000 1/	$340,100,000
1980	200,000,000 1/	370,000,000
1981	200,000,000 1/	370,000,000
1982	370,000,000	355,400,000
1983	370,000,000	355,400,000

Purpose: Enables undergraduate students with additional financial need to supplement a basic Pell grant, to meet educational expenses and promote equality of educational opportunity at the postsecondary level. Of the two types of SEOG grants, initial year grants are for students not previously receiving an SEOG, while continuing grants are for students who did receive a grant before. Funding for initial year grants is allocated separately from continuing year grants, but institutions have the option of transferring funds between the two. SEOG covers undergraduates enrolled on at least a half-time basis. Receipt of an SEOG is determined by an institution's financial aid office but the distribution of funds to schools is determined by the Department of Education by an allocation formula applied to the available appropriation.

Eligibility: Accredited higher education institutions.

Students are eligible if they are enrolled in an accredited institution at least half-time, and do not owe a refund on a Title IV grant or are not in default on a Title IV loan and meet citizen/resident requirements.

Applicant Requirements: Applicants file a financial statement with their institution from which the institution develops a measure of the students' "financial need". A statement of educational purpose must also be filed by the recipient.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Institutions may distribute the amount of the grant to the student in any manner over the course of the academic year for which it is awarded. Grants may be awarded for the period required to complete the first undergraduate baccalaureate course of study at the institution attended.

The institution determines which students will receive grants from the available fund allocation, with the option of reserving 10 percent for less than half-time students. The maximum amount of a grant is $2000 and no grant may be less than $200.

A portion of the funds for SEOG and College Work Study may be interchanged; up to 10 percent from each fund may be transferred to the other -- if the institution can provide more effective aid packaging by so doing.

Obligation of Grant Recipients: Students must maintain a satisfactory standard of progress as determined and certified by the institution attended.

State Allocation Formulas: Funds are allocated to States through a formula which is based upon full-time and part-time enrollment converted to a full-time equivalent (FTE) relative to the total number of students in the 53 State areas. Funds are allocated as initial year (IY), for first-time recipients only, or as continuing year (CY) for previous recipients of SEOG.

Allocations are computed in three stages:

1. A conditional guarantee, based on 1979-80 expenditure data for previously participating institutions, and on comparably eligible institutions for first-time participants.

2. An increase in an institution's conditional guarantee occurs when the sum of conditional guarantees for all institutions in a State is less than that State's FY 1980 allocation.

3. A further increase if the sum of the new conditional guarantees for all institutions nationally is less than the Federal SEOG appropriation.

The purpose of the three step process is to insure that institutions will receive at least the amount of their 1979-80 allocation. The conditional guarantee for previously participating institutions is the sum of their IY and CY allocations in 1979-80. For institutions applying for the first time the conditional guarantee is the greater of:

1. $5000.

2. 90 percent of the average IY per student expenditure at comparable eligible institutions multiplied by the enrollment of the applicant institution, plus the average CY per student expenditure at comparable eligible institutions multiplied by the enrollment at the applicant institution.

For institutions applying for a second subsequent time, the conditional guarantee is the greater of:

1. $5000
2. 90 percent of its current IY allocation, plus 100 percent of its current CY allocation.
3. The amount which would have been computed for a first-time application.

The conditional guarantee is divided between IY and CY funds based on the percentage that the institution's request for each type of aid bears to its total request.

Special Adjusted Conditional Guarantee: The funds available in 1982-83 were insufficient to honor the conditional guarantees in most States. Therefore, adjustments were computed in the following manner:

1. A State's 1982-83 allotment is equal to its 1981-82 allotment times the ratio of total SEOG funds available in 1982-83 to total SEOG funds available in 1981-82.
2. An institution's adjusted conditional guarantee is equal to its conditional guarantee times the ratio of the actual state allotment (determined in step 1) to the sum of all conditional guarantees to institutions in the state.

This pro-rated allocation procedure replaced the usual allocation formula for 1982-83.

Administrative Costs: Institutions receive payments for administrative costs based on the sum of their expenditures under the SEOG, CWS and NDSL programs. The amount payable is equal to 5% of the first $2,750,000 of expenditures plus 4% of the amount greater than $2,7500,000 and less than $5,500,000 plus 3% of anything in excess of $5,500,000. The institutional expenditure is the sum of the grants to students under SEOG, the compensation of students under CWS and the principal amount of loans made from the student loan fund under NDSL (excluding loans which have been assigned to the Secretary and are not being serviced by the institution).

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

FY 83 goals were:

- Expand the number of participating institutions.
- Maintain equitable distribution of aid to all institutions.
- Establish standard needs analysis systems and approve equivalent institutional analysis formulas so that all students will have equal opportunity to participate.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The SECG program has had a net increase of approximately 125 participating institutions a year (mostly proprietary) since 1978. In 1983-84, approximately 4200 institutions will share in the allocation distributed by the Department of Education.
- The program used formulas for 1982-83 award year allocations in order to insure the funding of all institutions at levels at least as favorable as in the preceding year. This replaced the usual allocation process under which some institutions would have had reductions from the previous year or would have had larger or smaller reductions than comparably-situated institutions.
- Tables of expected family contribution were published in the Code of Federal Regulations and limits established within which an institutional need analysis system would be approved as equivalent to the Federal system.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In award year 81-82 the program staff reported that there were 855,000 grants averaging $424 per student. This is a change from the previous year when 717,000 students received grants averaging $573 (E1, E2). Complete data for 1982-83 is not yet available.

Distribution of SEOG aid to first-time full-time dependent freshmen is shown for a two year period in tables 1 and 2. The overall participation rate for this group fell from 8.7 percent in 1980 to 5.9 percent in 1982. The participation rates for the lowest income groups decreased from 19.8 percent in 1980-81 to 15.1 percent in 1982-83 (less than $9999) and from 14.3 percent to 11.0 percent ($10,000-$19,999) over the same period. Average awards increased but represented about the same fraction of educational expenses in both years. Participation rates by cost of education showed the largest decrease in the $0-3000 category (7.6 percent to 3.6 percent) with the highest cost category, $6000+ going from 12.8% to 9.4% participation during this period.

Table 1

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, Fall 1980

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 TRHU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	640.	560.	560.	586.	653.	595.
	% AID	17.56	10.35	4.35	1.67	0.82	7.57
	RATIO	25.15	20.92	20.66	21.49	23.78	22.21
3001-4000	AVG $	688.	599.	576.	598.	1007.	632.
	% AID	19.27	12.13	4.46	1.62	0.72	6.85
	RATIO	20.18	17.46	16.75	17.39	29.06	18.38
4001-5000	AVG $	676.	678.	560.	579.	566.	644.
	% AID	22.22	16.24	8.23	3.06	1.16	10.10
	RATIO	14.80	14.79	12.24	12.67	12.39	14.08
5001-6000	AVG $	721.	668.	679.	693.	649.	685.
	% AID	18.16	15.80	8.60	3.68	1.12	10.32
	RATIO	13.68	12.62	12.79	13.02	12.09	12.90
6000 +	AVG $	850.	756.	728.	773.	901.	776.
	% AID	30.00	25.61	15.41	5.99	1.41	12.82
	RATIO	12.07	10.69	10.02	10.34	11.65	10.48
TOTAL	AVG $	699.	648.	632.	667.	818.	664.
	% AID	19.80	14.27	6.81	2.71	0.99	8.73
	RATIO	17.97	15.80	15.23	15.63	17.47	15.75

Data base = First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

Source: E.3

Table 2

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, Fall 1982

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	695.	627.	554.	541.	426.	624.
	% AID	8.55	5.19	3.27	1.33	0.26	3.57
	RATIO	24.75	22.21	19.52	19.00	15.02	22.02
3001-4000	AVG $	660.	574.	518.	528.	625.	590.
	% AID	11.72	6.60	3.02	1.63	0.69	4.08
	RATIO	18.50	16.02	14.47	14.67	17.33	16.45
4001-5000	AVG $	694.	661.	501.	518.	702.	622.
	% AID	16.17	11.19	4.82	2.44	0.91	5.52
	RATIO	15.70	15.00	11.37	11.73	15.84	14.08
5001-6000	AVG $	759.	638.	596.	712.	652.	666.
	% AID	17.16	11.45	5.25	2.13	0.51	5.67
	RATIO	14.33	12.10	11.31	13.49	12.30	12.61
6001 +	AVG $	1000.	889.	877.	915.	932.	911.
	% AID	21.76	20.42	13.14	7.01	2.01	9.44
	RATIO	12.76	11.06	10.77	10.86	10.27	10.70
TOTAL	AVG $	768.	709.	673.	729.	816.	722.
	% AID	15.07	10.95	5.74	2.97	1.10	5.87
	RATIO	16.38	14.72	13.71	14.35	14.06	14.06

Data base = First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

Source: E.4

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The equitable distribution of SEOG funds can be assessed by determining how it varies with measures of ability to pay. These may be individually oriented, e.g., family income for students, or group oriented, e.g., median income or average need within a State. Ideally, funds distributed should reflect ability to pay and cost of education.

Although originally targeted at only the neediest students, the SEOG program now applies to all students with any demonstrated financial need. Fiscal operations reports from institutions show recipient distributions by income level. Although this program report (Table 3) is for a different year (1981-82) and uses different income ranges than Tables 1 and 2, it shows distributions of both recipients and funds to be fairly even across the three lowest income categories. (E-1)

Table 3

Distribution of SEOG Recipients and Funds by Family Income

Income Levels	$ 0-5999	$ 6000-11999	$12000-17999	$18000-23999	$24000-29999	$30000 & up	Independents and at least 1/2 time
% of all SEOG Recipients	12.1	13.5	12.1	9.6	6.8	10.5	35.2
% of all SEOG funds	11.13	14.4	14.7	13.0	9.7	8.5	28.6

SOURCE: E.2

A more detailed breakdown showing the usefulness of SEOG funds percentage of educational costs covered for freshmen is available from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program's annual survey of freshmen. Tables 1 and 2 indicate that over the period 1980-82, there has been a moderate decrease in the fraction of costs covered (15.8 percent to 14.1 percent). As expected, SEOG funds cover a smaller percentage of college costs as those costs increase. For most income groups, the percentage of costs covered in the most expensive cost category was about half the percentage covered in the least expensive group of colleges.

The effectiveness of State allocation formulas has been studied by regression analysis between the amount of SEOG aid per full-time student and a measure of need within the State (E.5). The measure used was the average eligibility index for Pell Grants for students within the state. A positive correlation (r=.35) was found, but the relative weakness of the correction indicates that actual need for SEOG funds is not strongly indicated by application of State allocation formulas.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The administration proposes to terminate the SEOG program as part of a new self-help approach which would increase grants for the neediest students.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. 1981-82 Campus-Based Programs, unpublished tables from Campus-Based Analysis Section, Fall 1983.
2. 1981-82 Campus-Based Programs Annual Report, U.S. Department of Education, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Campus-Based Analysis-Section, December 1982.
3. Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81.
4. Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1982-83.
5. A Report on the Funds Distribution Formula Under the Campus-Based Student Aid Programs, U.S. Department of Education, March 15, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

The distribution of SEOG by race and sex is shown in Table 4. In general, black students have higher participation rates and larger awards than white students. The difference in participation rates between men and women is very small.

Table 4

PARTICIPATION IN THE SEOG PROGRAM BY SEX AND RACE FOR FIRST TIME, FULL TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS FALL 1982

	$1- 5,999	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,000	$40,000 AND UP	All
Men						
% Participating	16.7	13.6	7.7	3.5	1.2	5.7
Average Per Recipient	$ 773	$ 738	$ 670	$ 752	$813	$729
Women						
% Participating	15.5	13.3	7.7	3.7	1.0	6.1
Average Per Recipient	$ 810	$ 730	$ 701	$ 683	$814	$727
Black						
% Participating	17.5	17.4	9.3	5.9	8.0	10.4
Average Per Recipient	$1,339	$ 925	$ 817	$1,051	$462	$873
White						
% Participating	15.6	12.6	7.4	3.5	1.0	5.7
Average Per Recipient	$ 799	$ 735	$ 677	$ 707	$840	$725
All Students						
% Participating	16.0	12.9	7.7	3.6	1.1	5.9
Average Per Recipient	$ 794	$ 734	$ 685	$ 719	$814	$728

Source: E.4

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

The CIRP survey referred to in E.2 above provides annual data on the distribution of aid for Federal student aid programs for first-time full-time dependent freshman students. Data for the 1983-1984 academic year will be available during Spring 1984.

Contact for Further Information

Program Operations: James Kesler, (202) 245-9717

Program Studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Initial year authorization only.

STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.069)

Highlights:

- o Freshman student participation decreased between 1980-81 and 1982-83.
- o The number of States that have expanded the use of private sector funding and work-study to better serve needy students has doubled since 1980 (IIB).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318, the Education Amendments of 1976, Public Law 94-482, the Higher Education Technical Amendments, Public Law 95-43, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act, Public Law 95-566, a 1979 Technical Amendment, Public Law 96-96 and the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374; 20 U.S.C. 1070c; 34 CFR 692.

Funding Since 1979

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 50,000,000 [1]	$76,750,000
1980	50,000,000 [1]	76,750,000
1981	100,000,000	76,750,000
1982	76,800,000	73,680,000
1983	76,800,000	60,000,000

Purpose: Make incentive grants to the States to develop and expand grant assistance to students in attendance at institutions of postsecondary education.

Eligibility: All States are eligible to receive federal formula grants, which must be matched with funds from State resources. States with mature grant programs usually overmatch their SSIG allotments. In about half of the States - particularly those with newer programs - SSIG and State matching continue to make up the major portion of State grant effort. Within this context, the SSIG program ensures the availability of an agency within each State which is concerned with the exploration[2] and development of additional sources of grant assistance to students in postsecondary education.

Undergraduate students attending public, non-profit private, and (at State option) proprietary schools must meet citizen/resident requirements and have no outstanding Title IV default or refund payment due. At State option, graduate and less-than-half-time students may also be eligible. All nonprofit institutions are eligible to participate, except where excluded by the State constitution or by a State law enacted prior to October 1978.

Formula Requirements: Allotments to States are apportioned according to higher education enrollments.

Administrative Agencies: Under Section 1203 of the Higher Education Act each State designates an agency which receives Federal funds, provides matching State funds and distributes the total to eligible students. This agency may be part of the State government, an Education Department or division dealing with higher education, the organization managing other State/grant or loan programs, or a designated corporation acting for the State. The agency receives federal SSIG funds, matches them dollar for dollar with State funds, and distributes them to eligible students in the State student aid program.

Applicant Requirements: All States and territories may apply for formula grant allotments. Students apply annually for State grants under need criteria established by the State and approved by the Secretary of Education. They must apply through their institution or directly to the State agency.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Annual State allotments are forward funded for student awards in the next academic year. Since 1980, States have had the option to extend aid to graduate, as well as undergraduate, students.

Obligations of SSIG Recipients: Students must maintain satisfactory academic progress as certified by their institution. State agencies must submit annual and other reports required by ED and must keep auditable records for up to 5 years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

Continuing objectives of this program in FY 1983 were:

- Deliver student aid dollars to qualified recipients.
- Encourage States to explore ways of better serving needy students.
- Encourage private sector involvement to provide additional sources of funds. [2]
- Insure the availability of State agencies concerned with the distribution of grant aid to needy students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Total program funding has increased from $63.7 million to $76.7 million from 1978 to 1982. However, between 1980-81 and 1982-83, Freshman participation declined from 17.4 to 15.6 percent.
- Studies of scholarship programs in several states (e.g., Virginia and Georgia) have helped to identify the best mix of grants and loans to support the neediest students.
- In FY 1983 the number of States developing some form of private sector or work-related aid increased to 24, more than doubling the 10 which had State work-study programs in 1980.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: In FY 82 (award year 1982-83) Federal funds of $73,680,000 matched 50:50 by State funds for a total of $147,360,000, have been distributed to an estimated 294,720 recipients, with awards averaging $500 (of which half is federal money). The maximum award is $2000 per student.

Program Scope: In the 1982-83 award year, public institutions received 56 percent of SSIG funds and accounted for 72 percent of all recipients. Private schools received 41 percent of funds and had 26 percent of recipients. Proprietary and other non-profit institutions had 2 percent of funds and 2 percent of recipients. (E1)

Distribution of Aid: Surveys over the last two years have shown that the average award to freshmen recipients remained fairly stable (now at $718 compared to $708 two years ago) but with rising education costs, this has meant a drop from 16.8 to 14 percent in average award levels as related to total costs. (E.2, E.3) Details are shown in the next two tables.

State Grants To Students, Fall 1980[3]/

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		Family Income LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	690.	558.	539.	608.	815.	602.
	% AID	22.08	19.62	13.76	6.94	5.20	14.89
	RATIO	27.10	20.84	19.90	22.27	29.67	22.47
3001-4000	AVG $	698.	5.93	536.	621.	720.	609.
	% AID	27.91	23.78	15.29	8.78	4.75	15.73
	RATIO	20.45	17.27	15.58	18.05	20.78	17.70
4001-5000	AVG $	774.	697.	657.	696.	739.	704.
	% AID	32.06	28.68	19.20	11.84	6.03	19.91
	RATIO	16.96	15.21	14.36	15.24	16.16	15.40
5001-6000	AVG $	768.	680.	715.	754.	734.	716.
	% AID	28.69	27.30	17.76	11.13	6.72	19.62
	RATIO	14.56	12.85	13.47	14.16	13.68	13.49
6000 +	AVG $	1154.	1042.	1020.	967.	831.	1025.
	% AID	39.07	36.70	27.25	15.77	5.95	21.72
	RATIO	16.38	14.56	14.04	12.92	10.75	13.85
TOTAL	AVG $	772.	686.	671.	726.	766.	708.
	% AID	27.66	25.34	17.19	10.10	5.48	17.44
	RATIO	19.85	16.73	16.19	17.03	16.36	16.80

Note: Data base = First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

Source: Study E.2 cited above.

State Grants To Students, Fall 1982[3]

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	593.	567.	479.	556.	662.	555.
	% AID	16.91	14.57	13.21	9.37	7.03	12.26
	RATIO	21.11	20.07	16.88	19.50	23.33	19.58
3001-4000	AVG $	662.	577.	534.	539.	567.	576.
	% AID	20.75	17.98	12.83	7.92	4.90	12.30
	RATIO	18.56	16.11	14.90	14.99	15.70	16.06
4001-5000	AVG $	706.	600.	516.	530.	549.	579.
	% AID	29.34	24.88	17.46	10.12	6.19	15.46
	RATIO	15.96	13.62	11.70	11.99	12.39	13.09
5001-6000	AVG $	711.	576.	579.	641.	705.	618.
	% AID	38.66	33.23	18.93	8.53	5.20	17.87
	RATIO	13.44	10.91	11.00	12.15	13.29	11.70
6000 +	AVG $	1204.	1141.	1091.	1096.	956.	1103.
	% AID	35.86	33.19	25.83	18.10	6.56	18.83
	RATIO	15.37	14.20	13.39	13.02	10.53	12.95
TOTAL	AVG $	789.	704.	678.	735.	725.	718.
	% AID	28.16	25.15	17.65	10.68	5.89	15.63
	RATIO	16.83	14.62	13.81	14.47	12.49	13.98

Note: Data base = First-time Full-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) x 100

Source: Study E.3 cited above.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Plans are to withdraw funding for this program. Federal funds are considered unnecessary as a stimulant to encourage States to provide State-based aid. State expenditures for grant aid have continued to expand even as Federal funding has dropped or remained level in recent years. About half the States considerably overmatch the Federal allotment. The other States have been sustained through a development period and will now need to provide both halves of their student assistance outlays.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above

1. State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) Data Summary Reports, SSIG Program files, Division of Policy and Program Development, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

2. Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1980-81, unpublished tables derived by Planning and Evaluation Service of ED.

3. Cooperative Institutional Research Programs of the Higher Education Research Institute - Annual Survey of Freshmen 1982-83, unpublished tables derived by Planning and Evaluation Service of ED.

F. Other Supporting Data

The distribution of State grants to freshman by race, sex and family income is examined in the following table (E.2) for the 1982-83 award year.

PARTICIPATION IN STATE GRANTS 3/
BY SEX, RACE, AND FAMILY INCOME FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME
DEPENDENT STUDENTS: FALL 1982

	UNDER $6,000	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,999	$40000 PLUS	ALL INCOMES
Male						
% Participating	27.1	27.4	20.6	11.9	5.6	14.8
Average Per Recipient	$806	$742	$687	$717	$735	$722
Female						
% Participating	26.7	27.0	21.9	12.8	6.2	16.4
Average Per Recipient	$816	$741	$675	$707	$720	$717
Black						
% Participating	26.6	39.3	25.4	15.5	7.3	23.9
Average Per Recipient	$583	$667	$739	$754	$690	$693
White						
% Participating	26.3	26.8	20.7	12.2	5.8	15.4
Average Per Recipient	$804	$736	$667	$705	$739	$712
All Students						
% Participating	26.9	27.1	21.2	12.3	5.9	15.6
Average Per Recipient	$812	$742	$681	$712	$728	$720

No significant bias is apparent in this table although there is a noticeable difference in participation rate for black vs. white in the $6000-14999 family income range. The higher rate for blacks as compared to the other population elements (white, male, female, all students) actually is favorable to them.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies of the SSIG program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Lanora G. Smith, (202) 472-4265

Program studies: Robert Bart, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Plus such sums as may be needed for continuation students. Beginning in FY 1981, the statute combined initial and continuation grants under a single authorization.
2. For example, State agencies have developed additional funding sources by establishing cooperative programs with private industry. Work-study programs outside institutions have been implemented in some cases.
3. State grants include federal SSIG allotments plus required state matching and in many cases, overmatch from State funds. This accounts for the fact that average grants exceed the averages calculated for SSIG awards only ($500).

GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.032)

Highlights:

- o A new need analysis test for borrowers with family incomes of $30,000 and above resulted in lower participation rates in FY 1982 than in FY 1980. (Section II. C)
- o Among those borrowing, the guaranteed student loan paid for a smaller percentage of total educational cost in FY 1982 than in FY 1980. (Section II. C)
- o During FY 1982, average loan amounts decreased for freshmen borrowers in the lowest institutional cost categories compared with FY 1980, but increased in the highest cost category. (Section II. C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-329, Title IV-B, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1071. (Expires September 30, 1986 if not reauthorized prior to that date).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Loan Volume [1]	Obligations	Appropriation
1979	$2,984,000,000	$ 999,343,000	$ 957,503,000
1980	4,840,000,000	1,597,877,000	1,609,344,000
1981	7,824,000,000	2,721,115,000	2,535,470,000
1982	6,238,000,000	3,297,776,000	3,073,846,000
1983	6,969,000,000(est.)	2,942,072,000	3,100,500,000

Purpose: GSL: Authorizes low-interest loans to students and parents to help pay the students' costs of attending eligible postsecondary institutions, including colleges, universities, and vocational, technical, business and trade schools and certain foreign institutions for most students. Facilitates students' access to postsecondary education and enhances borrowers' choices among a broader range of institutions.

PLUS/Auxiliary: Same purposes as GSL but loans are made to parents of dependent undergraduates and to graduate and independent undergraduate students. PLUS/Auxiliary loans are less subsidized than regular GSL loans.

Eligibility: GSL: Varies from state to state. Generally, any U.S. citizen, National, or permanent resident in the United States for other than a temporary purpose, who is enrolled or accepted for enrollment on at least a half-time basis as an undergraduate, graduate, professional or vocational student at a participating postsecondary school may apply. A student that is presently enrolled at a participating institution must

Eligibility: (Continued)

be maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study he/she is pursuing. Also, the student may not owe a refund on any Title IV grant or be in default on any Title IV loans received while in attendance at that school. If the student's or the family's adjusted gross income is $30,000 or more the student/family must undergo a "need test" to determine eligibility for Federal in-school interest benefits.

PLUS/Auxiliary: Parents of dependent undergraduate students, graduate or professional students and independent undergraduate students are generally eligible for loans on the same basis as those borrowing under regular GSL provisions. An important exception is that there is no need test on the basis of income although lenders may restrict loans or loan amounts on the basis of the borrower's creditworthiness.

Application Procedure: GSL: Each year the student obtains an application for a loan from a lender, school, or State guarantee agency. The student completes his or her portion of the application and submits it to his/her school. The school must certify that the student is accepted for enrollment, is enrolled, and is maintaining satisfactory progress. The school must also provide information on the student's cost of education and other financial aid. The student then takes the application to a lender willing to make the loan. The lender completes its portion of the application and forwards it to the guarantor, usually the state agency, for commitment.

Upon commitment, the lender disburses the proceeds of the loan to the school and/or to the applicant. In most states, the borrower is required to pay usually from proceeds of the loan, an insurance premium which varies depending upon the particular state. In addition, the borrower pays a 5% "origination fee" which is used by the U.S. Department of Education to help defray the Federal interest benefits and special allowance costs. Students must re-apply for each year of school in which the loan is expected to be used.

PLUS/Auxiliary: The application procedure is identical to that for GSL borrowers except that, in the case of parent borrowers, loan proceeds are sent directly to them; and, no origination fee is charged on approved loans.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: GSL: Undergraduates may borrow up to $2500 annually for a total of $12,500 cumulatively. Graduate and professional students may borrow up to $5000 annually for a total of $25,000 cumulatively, including any undergraduate borrowing. Students make no payments and are charged no interest while they are attending school. During repayment, interest is currently charged at 8%. Loans made during previous years have carried interest rates of 7% and 9%. Repayment generally is made over 5 to 10 years beginning 9-12 months after the student ceases to be at least a half time student. The entire period from the date of original loan through completion of repayment may not exceed 15 years (excluding periods of authorized deferment and forbearance). Under the current Act, authorization expires September 30, 1986; authorization for loans to previous borrowers to complete education expires September 30, 1990.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: (Continued)

PLUS/Auxiliary program: Parents and graduate students may borrow up to $3,000 annually and $51,000 cumulatively. Independent undergraduates may borrow up to $2500 annually and $12,500 cumulatively inclusive of GSL borrowing. Interest is currently charged at a rate of 12% and repayment of both principal and interest must begin within sixty days of loan disbursement.

Obligations of Lenders and Borrowers:

Lenders must submit quarterly bills to the Department based on loans outstanding in order to receive interest benefits and special allowance payments. Additional operational reports are required for specific purposes.

Lenders, schools, and guarantee agencies are subject to periodic examination and audit by ED. Participating schools must have an independent audit of all GSLP transactions at least biennially.

Lenders must maintain records to support and identify loan transactions, interest billings, and/or special allowances. Guarantee agencies must maintain complete records to support and identify their activities. Federal regulations specify administrative and fiscal records required to be maintained by schools.

Borrowers are required by statute to keep lenders informed of their current addresses and of any change in their academic status. When in repayment, borrowers are expected to make payments on time and to continue to keep lenders informed of any change in address. These provisions, where applicable, apply equally to PLUS/Auxiliary borrowers.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal operating objectives with respect to this program were:

- to implement recent legislative amendments which principally provided for an analysis of financial need for GSL applicants whose families had incomes of $30,000 or more;
- to accelerate collections on defaulted loans, especially by private collection agencies under contract with the Secretary;
- to accelerate compliance actions involving fraud, waste, and abuse; and,
- to reduce the backlog of unresolved audits and accelerate the prosecution of defaulters through the Justice Department.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o Interest costs fell by over 200 million from FY 1982 to FY 1983 due in part to both the application of the new needs test and the fall in interest rates.
- o All new statutory provisions were implemented.
- o Collection activities of private collection agencies were increased, resulting in agency collections of $12.6 million in FY 1983.
- o All outstanding audits over six months in duration were resolved during this period. Also, a number of defaulted accounts were sent to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness:

Student Participation: Participation in the Guaranteed Student Loan Program is estimated to be about 28 percent of all eligible students, including graduate and professional students. For freshmen undergraduates for the Fall of 1982, the participation rate was 22.4 percent. (See Tables 2 and 3 for more details.) Participation rates and average loan amounts are primarily sensitive to cost of education. For the lowest cost category ($0-3000), the average freshmen participation rate in 1982 was 7.4 percent of all freshmen in that cost category. In the highest cost category ($6000+), 33.7 percent of all students borrowed under this program. Although a smaller percentage of students in the lowest cost schools participated, student loans paid for a larger percentage of their total costs. For example, in 1982 loans covered 47.9 percent of total cost in the least expensive category of institution, but paid for only 23.1 percent of total cost in the highest cost category. However, the average loan at the highest cost schools was about 50 percent higher than in the lowest cost schools. Because of the annual borrowing limits, students attending progressively more expensive institutions find that student loans will meet a smaller percentage of their total costs. (E.1) Data on the PLUS/Auxiliary program is not yet available.

Program Scope: GSL: In FY 1982, total loan volume in GSL amounted to 6.1 billion. This grew to an estimated $6.7 billion in FY 1983. Total loan recipients were 2.7 million in FY 1982 and 3.0 million are expected to participate in FY 1983. See Table 1 for additional details.

PLUS/Auxiliary: In FY 1982, PLUS/Auxiliary Loans amounted to $103 million while in FY 1983 this component of the program is expected to grow to $249 million. While only 42,000 participated in the PLUS/Auxiliary program in FY 1982, participation should increase to 95,000 in FY 1983. The cumulative outstanding loan volume amounted to $22.7 billion in FY 1982 and an estimated $26.5 billion in FY 1983.

Types of Benefits:

GSL: Loans are provided to students for which the Federal government pays the interest obligation (currently 8%) while the borrower is in school and during certain grace and deferment periods.[2]

Loan limits are $2500 annually and $12,500 cumulatively for undergraduates, and $5000 annually and $25,000 cumulatively (inclusive of undergraduate loans) for graduate students.

PLUS/Auxiliary Loans: Loans to parents of undergraduate students and independent and graduate students are provided at 12 percent interest with no in-school interest subsidy paid by the Federal Government.

PLUS/Auxiliary Loans limits are $3000 annually and $15,000 cumulatively for parents of dependent undergraduates and graduate students and $2500 annually and $12,500 cumulatively (inclusive of regular GSL amounts) for independent undergraduates.

Table 1

Summary of Loan Volume and Recipients
1981-82 and 1982-83

	1982	1983
Regular Loans		
Loan volume (in millions)	$6,135	$6,720
Recipients (in thousands)	2,746	2,981
Average Loan	$2,234	$2,254
Auxiliary Loans		
Loan volume (in millions)	$ 103	$ 249
Recipients (in thousands)	42	95
Average Loan	$2,452	$2,621
Total		
Loan volume (in millions)	$6,238	$6,969
Recipients (in thousands)	2,788	3,076
Average loan	$2,237	$2,266
Cumulative Outstanding Loan Volume (in millions)	$22,700	$26,500

Program Effectiveness:

With the cost of postsecondary education rising sharply during recent years, guaranteed student loans have become an increasingly important financial resource for students from families with incomes below $30,000 (See Tables 2 and 3).

The overall participation rate for undergraduates is estimated to be 28 percent. For first-time, full-time freshmen, however, the average participation rate in the Fall of 1982 was 22.4 percent and ranged from 4.4 to 46.3 percent depending on family income and cost of attendance.

The actual and/or anticipated impact of the needs test on borrowers from the $30,000+ income category can be seen by comparing Tables 2 and 3. For the $30-39,999 category, participation rates decreased between FY 1980 and FY 1982 from 24.8 percent to 23.5 percent and, in the $40,000+ category, from 20.0 percent to 11.8 percent. Decreases were even sharper among higher-income borrowers in the lowest-cost schools than in the highest-cost schools. Average loan amounts also decreased for the $30,000+ group. Furthermore, for this income group, loans comprised a smaller percentage of total costs in FY 1982 than in FY 1980. For the $30-39,999 income group, average loan amount as a percentage of average total cost declined from 42.9 percent in FY 1980 to 35.1 percent in FY 1982. This comparison, based on CIRP data, does not, however, distinguish between a one-time reduction due to the actual effect of new eligibility rules for borrowers and failure to apply for loans due to misunderstanding of new eligibility rules.

One of the major goals of the program has been to reduce the Federal interest subsidy costs of the Guaranteed Student Loan Program while assuring that students with financial need have adequate funding to attend college. It should be noted that during recent years several other factors affected loan volume and, therefore, subsidy costs. College costs rose at a higher rate than incomes; Social Security Benefits for freshman students were phased out, and the Pell Grant Program needs test was tightened. Also greater emphasis was placed on self help, (work and loans) as a means of financing educational costs. Due to a combination of higher educational costs, increased loan volume, and high interest rates, interest subsidy costs to the Federal Government rose from FY 1980 to FY 1982 by 107 percent while the number of borrowers increased by 21 percent and the average loan by less than ten percent. With the addition of the needs analysis test for borrowers with family incomes of $30,000, a total of only about $2.5 billion was required to cover total program costs in FY 1983 compared with $2.9 billion in FY 1982, suggesting that the administration's goal of reducing costs has been successful. However, interest rates were decreasing rapidly during FY 1983, a factor which explains much of the reduction in costs.

Table 2

Guaranteed Student Loans, Fall 1980
First-time Full-time Dependent Students

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU 19999	$20000 THRU 29999	$30000 THRU 39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	1091.	1276.	1514.	1654.	1865.	1458.
	% AID	8.12	12.58	15.33	15.75	10.03	12.71
	RATIO	42.85	47.70	55.84	60.61	67.94	54.43
3001-4000	AVG $	1215.	1500.	1738.	1831.	1988.	1693.
	% AID	14.84	22.08	25.59	23.78	16.94	21.49
	RATIO	35.62	43.69	50.53	53.23	57.33	49.23
4001-5000	AVG $	1325.	1549.	1713.	1865.	1988.	1700.
	% AID	18.08	21.86	25.82	25.77	19.51	22.67
	RATIO	29.02	33.81	37.43	40.85	43.50	37.17
5001-6000	AVG $	1348.	1527.	1689.	1795.	1989.	1675.
	% AID	14.86	21.15	28.18	28.41	23.61	23.69
	RATIO	25.56	28.86	31.80	33.72	37.06	31.55
6000 +	AVG $	1437.	1582.	1761.	1941.	2116.	1837.
	% AID	26.59	32.28	35.86	36.34	30.29	32.77
	RATIO	20.39	22.10	24.23	25.94	27.38	24.82
TOTAL	AVG $	1268.	1491.	1698.	1830.	2023.	1689.
	% AID	13.87	20.59	24.84	24.82	20.00	21.47
	RATIO	32.62	36.34	40.94	42.89	43.19	40.06

1/ Data base = First-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipients/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/Avg. Cost) 100
Source E.1

Table 3

Guaranteed Student Loans, Fall 1982
First-time Full-time Dependent Students

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		FAMILY INCOME LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 AND ABOVE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	1148.	1210.	1400.	1380.	1824.	1357.
	% AID	6.93	8.65	8.56	7.50	4.43	7.43
	RATIO	40.89	42.85	49.30	48.44	64.32	47.90
3001-4000	AVG $	1432.	1471.	1573.	1488.	1469.	1502.
	% AID	13.77	17.05	15.89	12.24	6.07	13.18
	RATIO	40.18	41.08	43.89	41.36	40.72	41.85
4001-5000	AVG $	1518.	1647.	1809.	1706.	1686.	1703.
	% AID	27.42	30.13	30.06	24.51	10.74	23.81
	RATIO	34.33	37.37	41.02	38.60	38.02	38.55
5001-6000	AVG $	1608.	1721.	1900.	1811.	1859.	1805.
	% AID	27.78	31.40	31.46	25.32	12.19	25.31
	RATIO	30.39	32.61	36.10	34.31	35.04	34.18
6001+	AVG $	1938.	1946.	1977.	1974.	1976.	1966.
	% AID	46.03	46.29	45.47	39.10	17.22	33.65
	RATIO	24.74	24.22	24.25	23.44	21.76	23.08
TOTAL	AVG $	1636.	1704.	1833.	1782.	1830.	1771.
	% AID	24.04	27.56	27.63	23.45	11.78	22.36
	RATIO	34.92	35.37	37.35	35.08	31.56	34.50

1/ Data base = First-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipients/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/Avg. Cost) 100

Source: E.1

D. Program Improvement:

The Department will continue to increase its efforts to collect on outstanding defaults during FY 1984 and to reduce the incidence of default by:

- o Expanding collection activities through referral of additional defaulted accounts to private collection agencies;
- o Sharing information on defaulted accounts with consumer credit bureaus;
- o Conducting computer matches to locate defaulters;
- o Increasing litigation in instances of fraud and abuse involving both lenders and individual defaulters;
- o Monitoring the total collections effort more closely.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1983.
2. Program files - Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education 1980, 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

The following table (Table 4) compares the average loan size and percent of students participating by family income groups for males, females, black, white, and all students. Male and female participation rates are nearly equal except in the lowest-income category where male participation is about one-fifth higher than female. Participation rates for whites and blacks on the whole are about equal. However, they are significantly higher for whites at lower income groups and higher for blacks in the higher income groups. There is no significant variation in average loan size by sex, race, or income, except in the lowest income category where loan amounts for Blacks are 50% below the average and in the $25-39,999 group where average loans for Blacks are nearly 30% above the mean.

Table 4

PARTICIPATION AND AVERAGE FIRST-YEAR LOAN AMOUNTS IN THE GSLP PROGRAM BY SEX AND RACE FOR FIRST TIME, FULL TIME DEPENDENT STUDENTS FALL 1982

	FAMILY INCOME					
	$1- 5,999	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,000	$40,000 AND UP	All
Male						
% Participating	24.6	28.3	27.5	25.1	11.4	22.4
Average Per Recipient	$1,501	$1,547	$1,692	$1,681	$1,710	$1,658
Female						
% Participating	20.7	25.8	26.9	25.2	12.2	22.4
Average Per Recipient	$1,571	$1,564	$1,661	$1,696	$1,710	$1,658
Black						
% Participating	19.6	20.0	20.7	23.1	21.8	21.1
Average Per Recipient	$1,030	$1,312	$1,612	$1,949	$1,611	$1,574
White						
% Participating	23.5	27.1	27.0	25.1	11.6	22.4
Average Per Recipient	$1,554	$1,555	$1,680	$1,687	$1,707	$1,657
All Students						
% Participating	22.4	26.9	27.2	25.2	11.8	22.4
Average Per Recipient	$1,538	$1,556	$1,677	$1,688	$1,710	$1,657

Source: E.1

III. Response to GEPA 417(b):

Studies in progress are:

1. A study entitled "Analysis of the Distribution of College Costs, Parental Contribution, and Federal Student Assistance" will provide additional analyses of the financial aid needs of students in relation to Federal student aid subsidies. The expected completion date is February, 1984.
2. The CIRP survey referred to in E.1 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time, full-time freshmen. Data for the 1983-1984 academic year will be available during Spring of 1984.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: David Bayer, (202) 245-2475

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. All volume figures represent commitments rather than disbursements.
2. The borrower arranges the term of repayment with the lender. Deferment of repayment is provided when the student returns to full-time study at an eligible educational institution or enrolls in certain graduate fellowship programs. A deferment period of up to three years is also provided while the borrower is serving an active duty in the Armed Forces or the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps, in the Peace Corps, or full-time volunteer programs conducted by ACTION, or during comparable full-time volunteer service in a non-profit organization. Repayment is also deferred during a single period, not to exceed one year, during such time that the borrower is seeking but unable to find full-time employment, during required preprofessional internships (up to two years), and during periods of temporary total disability of the borrower or his spouse (up to three years).

Direct Loan Program

(CFDA No. 84.038)

Highlights:

- The average Direct Loan for first-time full-time students increased between 1980-81 and 1982-83 from $1046 to $1138, an average annual increase of 4.3 percent. (Section II.C)
- Program participation rates for first-time, full-time students declined sharply over the two-year period from 9.9 percent to 6.7 percent. (Section II.C)
- In 1982-83 the average Direct Loan for first-time full-time students constituted only 22.2 percent of average total cost compared with 24.8 percent in 1980-81. (Section II.C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-329, Title IV, Part E; 20 U.S.C. 1087aa-1087ii; Public Laws 92-318, 94-482, 96-49, 96-566, 96-536, 96-374, and 97-12.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$400,000,000	$328,900,000
1980	400,000,000	300,800,000
1981	400,000,000	200,800,000
1982	286,000,000	193,360,000
1983	286,000,000	180,860,000

Purpose: To provide low-interest loans to financially needy students to help pay their cost of attending institutions of higher education as well as vocational, technical, business and trade schools. The Direct Loan program is the smaller of two loan programs which together are a major component of the financial aid system consisting of grants, work, and loans.

Relationship to Other Student Aid Programs: The Direct Loan program is one of two loan programs, the other being the Guaranteed Student Loan program. The Direct Loan program is the loan component of the "campus-based programs" which are directly administered by financial aid officers at postsecondary institutions. Direct Loans help provide the financial aid officer flexibility in designing student aid packages which help meet individual student needs. They are often combined with one or more additional Federal student aid programs (Pell Grant, SEOG, Work Study, GLS) to provide a financial assistance package for financially needy students.

Recipients Eligibility: Accredited postsecondary institutions meeting eligibility requirements may participate. Funds are first allotted among the States according to statutory formula, then to institutions under both statutory requirements and program regulations.

The State apportionment formula is based on: the ratio of full-time enrollees in institutions of higher education within the State to the total number of such persons enrolled in all the States. If necessary, additional funds are apportioned to each State to make that apportionment equal to its allotment for 1972. Ninety percent of the funds are allotted according to the above formula (E.3).

Remaining funds are apportioned so that each institution receives its Federal Capital Contribution (FCC) as follows:

An individual institution's level of Direct Loan funds is determined in three stages:

1. A "Conditional Guarantee";
2. A "State Increase" based on its fair share of the state apportionment; and
3. A "National Increase" based on its fair share of the National appropriation.

The Conditional Guarantee is determined as follows:

A. For an institution currently participating in the Direct Loan program, its Conditional Guarantee is equal to the greater of:

   1. 90% of its base year level of expenditures; or
   2. 90% of its current finding level, times its utilization rate which equals:

      an institution's base year level of Direct Loan funds divided by its Direct Loan funds available in the base year.

B. An institution which is a first-time applicant to the program receives a Conditional Guarantee equal to the greater of:

   1. $5,000; or,
   2. 90% of the average per student Direct Loan expenditure in the base year at comparable eligible schools times the applicant institution's base year enrollment.

Recipients Eligibility (Continued)

C. A second-time applicant institution receives a Conditional Guarantee equal to the greater of:

1. Option A or Option B, as explained above or
2. 90 percent of its current year funding level.

The State and National Increases are used to increase the level of Direct Loan funds of institutions in a State if the combined FCCs resulting from the Conditional Guarantees of all institutions in the State are less than the State's already-determined apportionment and if national appropriations are greater than the State allotments.

Beneficiaries Eligibility: Students are eligible for a loan if they are enrolled on at least a half-time basis and are making satisfactory academic progress as determined by the institutions, or have been accepted for enrollment for at least half time at an eligible institution, and are United States citizens or are in the U.S. for other than a temporary purpose and intend to become permanent residents. Direct Loan applicants must demonstrate financial need as determined by one of the approved needs analysis systems.

Obligations of Direct Loan Recipients: Recipients: Participating institutions must submit a combined Fiscal Operations Report and Application Form which functions both as an application for future funds and as an annual report of past operations for SEOG, WS, and Direct Loans.

Beneficiaries: Before leaving the institution, the borrower must have an exit interview with appropriate school officials and must sign a repayment schedule which specifies the amount and length of repayment.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Recipients: Each institution maintains a Revolving Fund which receives annual Federal Capital Contributions, repayments from loans previously made, and an annual administrative allowance. The institution makes loans to borrowers from cash flow available in the Revolving Fund.

Beneficiaries: Students may borrow a total of: (a) $3,000 if they are enrolled in a vocational program or if they have completed less than two years of a program leading to a bachelor's degree; (b) $6,000 if they are undergraduates and have already completed two years of study toward a bachelor's degree (this total includes any amount borrowed under the Direct Loan Program for the first two years of study); (c) $12,000 for graduate or professional study (this total includes any amount borrowed under the Direct Loan Program for undergraduate study).

Duration and Phasing of Assistance (Continued)

Students make no payments and are charged no interest while they are attending a postsecondary institution. Loan repayment begins six months after the borrower leaves school. The duration of repayment is usually ten years and the borrower may repay on a monthly, bi-monthly, or quarterly basis.

The borrower's repayment period may be deferred not to exceed three years for service as a volunteer with VISTA, the Peace Corps, a tax-exempt organization performing service comparable to VISTA or Peace Corps, for military service or for service as an officer in the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Helath Service. Repayment may also be deferred during a period not to exceed three years during which the borrower is temporarily totally disabled or is unable to secure employment because he or she is providing care required by a spouse who is so disabled. Two year deferments are granted to borrowers who are serving internships required to begin professional practice or service. A percentage of the total loan amount may be cancelled for individuals providing special services in specific teaching areas and for members of the Armed Forces of the United States' serving in areas of hostility.

A borrower may have up to 100 percent of the loan cancelled if he or she teaches full-time in an elementary or secondary school serving low-income students or in full-time teaching of the handicapped. Loan cancellation rates are 15 percent of the original loan principal, plus interest on the unpaid balance, for the first and second years of teaching; 20 percent of such principal and interest for the third and fourth years of teaching; and 30 percent for the fifth year. Up to 100 percent cancellation must be under certain conditions if the borrower serves as a full-time staff member in a Head Start program. An institution must cancel up to 50 percent of a loan when the borrowers serves in the Armed Forces for at least one year. There is also cancellation of any remaining loan obligation upon the death of the borrower or in the event of permanent and total disability.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During 1982-83, the Department of Education emphasized the need for institutions to collect past loans more effectively and thus make more loan funds available to students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

An increasing volume of defaulted Direct Loans were turned over to the Department of Education for collection. In many instances, these defaulted loans were not being successfully pursued by colleges and universities. Turning over such loans to the Department has resulted in more effective collection by commercial collection agencies under contract to ED. In 1982-83, $20.0 million was collected in defaulted loans returned to ED by institutions for collection, an increase of 77 percent over the 1981-82 figure of $11.3 million. The Department is also intensifying its regulation and oversight of loan portfolio quality by strengthening due diligence requirements which colleges must meet in carrying out their collection activities.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Private colleges and universities were allotted 47 percent of the 1982-83 Federal Capital Contribution although they enroll only about 22 percent of all students. Private universities and four-year institutions received 45 percent ($78.5 million) while private two-year colleges received 2 percent ($3.5 million). Public universities and four-year institutions received 38 percent ($65.9 million) and public 2-year colleges, 3 percent ($5.2 million). Borrowers attending Proprietary schools received about 12 percent of NDSL capital contribution (E.D).

Student Participation: During 1981-82, total Direct Loan funds of approximately $590 million were awarded to an estimated 750,266 borrowers. The average award was $774. This is the latest available data.

The average Direct loan to first-time, full-time freshmen generally increased from $1046 in 1980-81 to $1138 during the two-year period from 1980-81 thru 1982-83 (See Tables 1 and 2), an average annual increase of 4.4 percent. Increases in average loan amounts occurred primarily among freshman recipients attending medium and higher cost institutions. For example, freshmen attending schools costing between $4001-$5000 had average loans of $1115 in 1982-83 and $983 in 1980-81. Those attending the most expensive category of institutions ($6001+) had average loans of $1273 in 1982-83 and $1142 in 1980-81. However, freshmen in the least expensive colleges ($0-$3000) had average decreases in average loan amounts. For example, these borrowers had average loans of $778 in 1982-83 and $859 in 1980-81, an average decrease of 5.2 percent annually during the two-year period. A similar decline occurred for recipients in the next least expensive institutional category ($3001-4000).

The percentage of freshmen participating in the Direct Loan program declined very sharply from 1980-81 thru 1982-83. In 1980-81, 9.9 percent of all students received a Direct loan. In 1982-83, however, only 6.7 percent of all students participated in this program. This decline in participation occurred across all institutional cost categories and the reduction of participation rates was pronounced both for the group attending the least expensive category of colleges and for the group attending the highest cost category of institutions. For example, in the lowest-cost category ($0-$3000), there was a decline in participation from 5.8 percent in 1980-81 to 2.0 percent in 1982-83 (E.2).

Types of Benefits Provided: The program pays an annual Federal Capital Contribution to the institution and the institution provides a 1:9 matching share. The institution is also entitled to an administrative cost allowance for the Direct Loan, Work Study, and SEOG funds which equals five (5) percent of the first $2,750,000, plus four (4) percent for expenditures greater than $2,750,000 but less than $5,500,000, plus three (3) percent for expenditures in excess of $4,400,000.

Students receive low-interest loans which may be repaid over a long period of time (up to ten years) and may also be eligible for deferral for various types of service (see "Duration and Phasing of Assistance"). In addition, borrowers may have all or a portion of their Direct Loan obligation cancelled if they teach in an elementary or secondary school officially designated as a low-income school.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: The annual Federal Capital Contribution for Direct Loans is allotted first to States, then to institutions within each State, and finally to students. An important issue for program effectiveness is the extent to which these different allocation patterns result in an equitable distribution of funds consistent with legislative intent.

State Distributions

The Direct Loan allotment formula has only a single criterion: the ratio of higher education full-time enrollment within a State to total full-time enrollment in all States and areas. It is not surprising, therefore, that the number of students receiving Direct Loans within States is highly correlated (.99) with full-time enrollment within States. However, when the average amount of Direct Loan per full-time student within each State is compared with a measure of student financial need (the mean Pell Grant eligibility index for that State), there is a moderately strong correlation (.51). These comparisons tend to show that FCC allotments to States, while proportional to enrollment, are also moderately well correlated with the financial need of students within States (E.3).

Student Distributions

Although State allotments correlate only moderately well with a measure of overall student need within States, redistribution of Direct Loan funds by institutions themselves appears to be consistent with legislative intent.

It is generally agreed that a measure of equity is achieved when 1) program participation rates are highest for recipients from lower-income families and decrease as family income increases, 2) the average amount of direct loan for a given educational cost range shows moderate variation with income as a percentage of average total cost. Using these equity criteria, it can be seen from Tables 1 and 2 that a fair degree of equity has been achieved in the distribution of Direct Loans to students.

For example, Direct Loan participation rates range from about 12 percent in the lowest family income category (less than $9900) to only 3.3 percent in the highest income category ($40,000 or more). This indicates that a larger percentage of needier students receive Direct Loans, as intended. Direct Loans comprise between 21 percent and 23 percent of average total cost of recipients (Table 2). Although only a small percentage of recipients from higher-income families participate in the program, their greater financial need often reflects special circumstances and most often they are attending lower-cost schools. Although the higher income groups receive larger Direct Loans comprising a larger percentage of total costs, the net effect of Direct Loan distributions is to fulfill the equity criteria.

Table 1

Full-Time Freshmen

Direct Loan, Fall 1980
First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU 19999	$20000 THRU 29999	$30000 THRU 39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	650.	767.	946.	1197.	1604.	859.
	% AID	7.25	7.51	6.09	3.58	1.59	5.80
	RATIO	25.52	28.66	34.91	43.88	58.42	32.07
3001-4000	AVG $	732.	934.	1147.	1397.	1717.	1067.
	% AID	12.18	14.70	10.49	6.09	2.99	9.55
	RATIO	21.46	27.21	33.34	40.61	49.52	31.02
4001-5000	AVG $	821.	896.	1055.	1186.	1366.	983.
	% AID	14.76	13.97	11.15	6.28	3.18	10.20
	RATIO	17.98	19.55	23.04	25.97	29.88	21.50
5001-6000	AVG $	915.	1015.	1060.	1250.	1574.	1071.
	% AID	11.40	13.45	11.80	7.56	4.62	10.64
	RATIO	17.36	19.18	19.97	23.48	29.33	20.17
6000 +	AVG $	1024.	1073.	1097.	1278.	1571.	1142.
	% AID	25.91	26.47	22.41	12.64	4.45	16.41
	RATIO	14.53	14.99	15.10	17.08	20.33	15.43
TOTAL	AVG $	811.	948.	1084.	1297.	1600.	1046.
	% AID	11.98	13.84	11.14	6.74	3.31	9.85
	RATIO	20.85	23.10	26.14	30.40	34.15	24.81

Date base = First-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/Avg. Cost) 100

Source: E.2.

Table 2

Direct Loan, Fall 1982
First-Time Full-Time Dependent Students

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU 19999	$20000 THRU 29999	$30000 THRU 39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	812.	662.	742.	906.	1357.	778.
	% AID	2.88	2.85	2.55	0.90	0.64	2.03
	RATIO	28.93	23.45	26.14	31.80	47.85	27.46
3001-4000	AVG $	906.	963.	930.	1032.	1428.	991.
	% AID	4.61	5.25	3.99	2.58	1.36	3.53
	RATIO	25.41	26.91	25.97	28.70	39.59	27.61
4001-5000	AVG $	865.	1064.	1228.	1156.	1278.	1115.
	% AID	12.62	13.64	9.80	5.73	2.05	7.94
	RATIO	19.57	24.14	27.84	26.15	28.82	25.24
5001-6000	AVG $	932.	1014.	1175.	1157.	1354.	1096.
	% AID	12.83	11.22	8.88	4.85	1.72	7.12
	RATIO	17.62	19.21	22.33	21.92	25.51	20.75
6000 +	AVG $	1176.	1254.	1228.	1375.	1381.	1273.
	% AID	17.97	18.51	15.28	10.38	2.83	10.28
	RATIO	15.00	15.61	15.06	16.33	15.21	14.94
TOTAL	AVG $	973.	1084.	1166.	1219.	1357.	1138.
	% AID	9.98	10.65	8.43	5.36	2.03	6.73
	RATIO	20.76	22.51	23.77	24.01	23.39	22.16

Date base = First-time Freshman Dependent
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipient/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/Avg. Cost) 100

Source: E.2.

Table 3

Participation in the Direct Loan Program By Sex and Race for First-time, Full-time Dependent Students Fall 1982

	$1-5,999	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,000	$40 +	All
Male						
% Participating	8.7	11.2	9.0	5.8	2.0	6.3
Average Per Recipient	$ 879	$ 983	$1,095	$1,183	$1,311	$1,102
Female						
% Participating	9.1	10.5	10.0	6.7	2.1	7.1
Average Per Recipient	$ 964	$ 994	$1,087	$1,185	$1,278	$1,097
Black						
% Participating	14.0	11.8	16.4	4.2	2.7	9.9
Average Per Recipient	$ 726	$1,154	$ 809	$1,102	$1,527	$ 976
White						
% Participating	9.1	10.4	9.2	6.1	2.0	6.6
Average Per Recipient	$ 944	$ 998	$1,096	$1,201	$1,319	$1,111
All Students						
% Participating	9.0	10.8	9.5	6.2	2.0	6.7
Average Per Recipient	$ 929	$ 989	$1,091	$1,184	$1,295	$1,100

Source: E.2.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

In FY 1984 $16,060,000 was appropriated for a capital contribution to institutional revolving loan funds in addition to approximately $530,487,000 available in institutions for new loans from loans in repayment. An amount of $19,800,000 was requested to meet payments to institutions when student loans are cancelled by teaching obligations.

Increased efforts are being made to reduce outstanding defaults in the Direct Loan program by strengthening institutional due diligence requirements and by intensifying collection activities. These efforts will result in more funds becoming available for new loans.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

2. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1983.

3. "A Report on the Funds Distribution Formula Under the Campus-Based Programs". U.S. Department of Education. March 15, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Table 1 and 2 provide the distribution of Direct Loan Freshmen by family income and cost of education as well as the average loan amount and the percentage of total cost met by these loans. Table 3 provides the distribution by income, race and sex. Data for the 1983-84 academic year will be available in the Spring of 1984. The data indicates that women as a whole had higher rates of participation although loan amounts were almost the same as men. Blacks, however, generally borrowed at higher rates than whites but considerably smaller amounts. These comparisons vary somewhat by income but are generally consistent.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

Studies in progress are as follows:

1. The CIRP survey referred to in E.1 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time full-time freshmen by race and by sex.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Coates, (202) 245-2320

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-7884

WORK STUDY PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.033)

Highlights:

- o Although Work Study (WS) funds are distributed to students on the basis of financial need, funds are distributed to states on the basis of the number of students in states.
- o Although the average WS award[1] for first time full time students (FTFT) increased from $686 to $725, it met a smaller percentage of total cost in 1982-83 than in 1980-81. (II. C)
- o The percentage of FTFT students participating declined from 15.0 in 1980-81 to 12.8 in 1982-83. (II. C)
- o Total program funding increased in FY 1983-84 to $590 million from $528 million in 1982-83. (I)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965; Public Law 89-329, Title IV, Part C; 42 U.S.C. 2751-2756b; Public Law 92-318, 94-482, 95-566, 96-374, and 97-12.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$600,000,000	$550,000,000
1980	630,000,000	550,000,000
1981	670,000,000	550,000,000
1982	550,000,000	528,000,000
1983	550,000,000	590,000,000

Purpose: To stimulate and promote part-time employment for students attending postsecondary institutions who need the earnings to help meet the cost of their education. Federal grants to institutions are used to subsidize up to 80 percent of a student's part-time wages with the remainder provided by the employer, which may be the institution itself.

Authorization for Work Study programs also provides for Job Location and Development Centers which assist students in locating potential part-time employment. Up to 10 percent of the Work Study grant up to a maximum of $25,000 may be used to support these centers.[3]

The institution is also entitled to an administrative cost allowance for expenditures which equals five (5) percent of the first $2,750,000, plus four (4) percent for expenditures greater than $2,750,000 but less than $5,500,000, plus three (3) percent for expenditures in excess of $5,500,000.

Relationship to Other Student Aid Programs

The Work Study program is the work component of the financial aid system consisting of grants, work, and loans. It provides the student with an alternative to using loans for meeting educational costs. In some instances, when used with loans, it can provide sufficient funds to attend a higher cost college. The majority of Work Study awards to individuals are used for on-campus employment and the remainder for off-campus public service jobs or jobs with non-profit organizations.

Eligibility: Accredited higher education institutions (public, other non-profit, and proprietary) meeting eligibility requirements, and non-profit organizations, including educational institutions, may participate as employers. Funds are first allotted among the States according to statutory formula and then to institutions under both statutory requirements and program regulations.

Allocation of Funds: One percent of each year's WS appropriation is reserved for Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. An unspecified amount is also reserved for students from the last two of these areas who attend institutions outside of those areas. Ninety percent of the remaining funds are allotted by formula to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Northern Mariana Islands and Puerto Rico. The balance makes up the national appropriation.

WS funds to be distributed to institutions are computed in three stages:

1. A "Conditional Guarantee",
2. A "State Increase" based on its "fair share" of the State apportionment (noted above), and
3. A "National Increase" based on its "fair share" of the national appropriation.

The WS Conditional Guarantee is computed as follows:

A. An institution that participated in the WS program in the base year receives a Conditional Guarantee equal to its 1979-80 expenditure (unless it has suffered a substantial enrollment decline).

B. An institution applying for first-time participation receives an award equal to the greater of:

   1. $5,000; or
   2. 90 percent of the average per student WS base year expenditure at comparable eligible institutions, multiplied by the applicant school's base year enrollment.

C. An institution applying for the second time to the CWS program receives a Conditional Guarantee equal to the greater of:

   1. The funds determined by Section B.1 above; or
   2. The funds determined by Section B.2 above; or
   3. 90 percent of its current year allocation.

Allocation of Funds (Continued)

In any year in which the combined Conditional Guarantees of all the institutions in a State are less than the State's allotment as determined above, the awards to institutions in that State may be increased (i.e., a "State Increase" occurs). If the sum of the Conditional Guarantees and State Increases awarded to institutions is less than the national WS appropriation for that year, additional funds are provided through a similar "National Increase."

The State apportionment formula is based equally on three factors:

1) The number of full-time postsecondary students in a State relative to the total number of students in the 53 areas;

2) The number of high school graduates in each State relative to the total number for the 53 areas; and

3) The number of related children under 18 years of age living in families with incomes of less than $3,000 in each area relative to the total number of such children in the 53 areas.

Obligations of Work-Study Recipients:

Recipients: Annual reports are required.

Beneficiaries: Student participants must maintain satisfactory academic progress.

Beneficiaries' Eligibility: Undergraduate, graduate, or professional students enrolled or accepted for enrollment as regular students who are maintaining satisfactory progress in accordance with the standards and practices of the institution. They must demonstrate financial need as determined by the institution using an ED approved needs analysis system, cannot owe a refund on a Title IV grant, not be in default on a Title IV loan, and meet citizen/resident requirements. The size of the award depends on the rate of pay and number of hours worked. The minimum wage law applies.

Applicant Requirements:

Recipients: Participating institutions submit a single Fiscal Operations Report and Application Form for the Work Study, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant and National Direct Student Loan Programs. Newly participating institutions submit only the application form.

Beneficiaries: Eligible students apply for assistance to the institution's student financial aid office.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance:

Recipients: Funds are awarded for use by participating institutions for one award year at a time.

Beneficiaries: Work Study awards are not automatically renewed but are made annually as part of a financial aid package to those demonstrating financial need.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: (Continued)

Additional funds are to be allotted, if necessary, to make each State's allotment equal to its FY 1972 allotment.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department of Education emphasized the following goals and objectives with respect to the Work Study program:

- To encourage use of Work Study funds to support tutoring for adult literacy and employment at eligible day-care centers.

- To promote greater use of Job Location and Development Centers which provide support to institutional administrators in locating and developing part-time off-campus employment for students.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Approximately 400 institutions had established Job Locator and Development Centers by the beginning of the 1982-83 school year.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: During 1982-83, approximately $523 million in Work Study funds went to institutions. This provided partial funding for 820,000 students along with administration costs. Private four-year institutions received 38 percent (over $220 million) while private two-year institutions received 1.4 percent or $8 million. Public four-year institutions received 42 percent ($246 million); public two-year schools were allocated 16 percent ($94 million); and proprietary institutions were awarded 25 percent, or, $14 million.

Information on WS awards for FY 1983 by student by institutional type and control is not available. However, a recent study (E.3) of all student employment administered by the institution through the aid office indicates that in the Fall of 1982, about 13 percent of all educational costs were covered by institutionally administered work programs which is consistent with data collected from first time full time students on WS participation. (E.1)

The study estimates that Work-Study earnings financed about 19 percent of all costs in public institutions but only 10 percent in privately controlled schools even though private colleges received a proportionately higher total amount than public institutions. Dollar awards, which averaged between $720 for freshmen to $830 for juniors and seniors, were generally higher in private institutions but by less than $100 in most cases. (E.3)

In addition, approximately 400 institutions had established Job Location and Development Centers by the beginning of the 1982-83 school year according to program information. (E.1)

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Student Participation: Average Work Study awards[1] for first time full time dependent students generally increased over the two-year period from FY 1980 to FY 1982 (Tables 1 and 2); however, this increase was partly offset by decreases for selected recipient groups, measured by family income and cost of education. In particular, there were decreases in average Work Study awards for recipients in the lowest family income categories (less than $9999) attending the two lowest educational cost categories ($0-$3000 and $3001-$4000). Only at the most expensive institutions ($6001+) were there consistent increases in average awards during the period. However, that increase averaged only 3% annually for the two-year period.

The percentage of first time full time dependent students participating in the Work-Study program also declined from about 15 percent in FY 1980 to 12.8 percent in FY 1982. Decreases in participation were characteristic of the entire institutional cost range although the decline in the highest cost colleges was small. Some increases in participation rates occurred in the $20,000-$40,000 family income groups attending the least expensive institutions. Increased WS participation, however, was observed for this same income group attending the highest cost category of institutions.

Information on graduate and professional student participants is limited. However, in FY 1981 they made up slightly more than ten percent of all recipients. Earnings averaged $593 compared with the national average of $701. Independent undergraduate students earned $941 and made up almost 21 percent of all recipients. Undergraduate dependent student earnings ranged from $718 to $777 depending upon family income (E.3).

Types of Benefits Provided: The program pays up to 80 percent of the earnings of students in eligible jobs to institutions or participating public or private nonprofit organizations, thus assuring students of work opportunities. Proprietary institutions receive WS funds only for students employed in public or private non-profit organizations. In addition, the participating institutions gain the services of students at one-fifth of the usual cost because of the Federal subsidy.

Table 1

Participation of First Time Full Time Dependent Students in Work-Study Grant Program, Fall 1980

Family Income

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	613.	602.	623.	581.	630.	610.
	% AID	21.21	16.52	9.78	5.08	2.61	12.18
	RATIO	24.09	22.50	22.97	21.30	22.97	22.76
3001-4000	AVG $	626.	642.	628.	639.	744.	638.
	% AID	22.24	20.03	12.74	6.54	2.43	12.63
	RATIO	18.36	18.71	18.25	18.59	21.47	18.55
4001-5000	AVG $	663.	670.	699.	709.	598.	677.
	% AID	28.78	22.62	15.02	8.76	3.27	15.76
	RATIO	14.52	14.62	15.28	15.53	13.08	14.80
5001-6000	AVG $	682.	719.	737.	735.	745.	721.
	% AID	18.24	20.41	17.72	11.60	4.87	15.96
	RATIO	12.93	13.60	13.87	13.80	13.87	13.59
6000 +	AVG $	814.	812.	801.	787.	756.	801.
	% AID	41.35	38.86	32.24	19.74	5.90	24.22
	RATIO	11.55	11.35	11.02	10.52	9.78	10.82
TOTAL	AVG $	662.	683.	697.	703.	720.	686.
	% AID	23.64	21.54	15.38	9.08	3.63	14.96
	RATIO	17.03	16.65	16.81	16.48	15.37	16.28

Data base = First-time Freshman Dependent Student
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipients/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG COST) 100

Source: Secondary Data Analysis of Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Fall 1982, OPBE/PES/SIAD

Table 2

Participation of First Time Full Time Dependent Students in Work-Study Grant Program, Fall 1982

COST OF EDUCATION ($)		Family Income LESS THAN $9999	$10000 THRU $19999	$20000 THRU $29999	$30000 THRU $39999	$40000 OR MORE	TOTAL
0-3000	AVG $	570.	615.	579.	634.	568.	594.
	% AID	12.47	14.72	10.21	6.87	2.58	10.46
	RATIO	20.30	21.76	20.37	22.24	20.02	20.98
3001-4000	AVG $	565.	592.	602.	607.	717.	599.
	% AID	14.52	11.35	7.56	5.21	2.50	7.71
	RATIO	15.84	16.54	16.81	16.87	19.88	16.69
4001-5000	AVG $	671.	580.	680.	653.	764.	649.
	% AID	21.05	17.91	12.26	7.16	3.10	10.68
	RATIO	15.17	13.17	15.41	14.78	17.24	14.68
5001-6000	AVG $	682.	719.	724.	696.	658.	706.
	% AID	24.37	18.66	12.78	7.77	3.51	11.65
	RATIO	12.88	13.62	13.76	13.19	12.40	13.37
6001 +	AVG $	831.	854.	844.	864.	842.	849.
	% AID	38.02	38.78	34.14	25.31	8.19	23.54
	RATIO	10.61	10.63	10.35	10.25	9.27	9.96
TOTAL	AVG $	685.	702.	738.	753.	782.	725.
	% AID	21.93	19.31	14.69	10.23	4.61	12.76
	RATIO	14.62	14.57	15.04	14.82	13.48	14.13

Data base = First-time Freshman Dependent Student
AVG $ = Average Dollars Per Recipient
% AID = # of Recipients/Total Students
RATIO = (AVG $ Per Recipient/AVG Cost) 100

Source: Secondary Data Analysis of Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Fall 1982, OPBE/PES/SIAD

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness:

There is a critical question about whether WS funds have been distributed in a manner that is consistent with the legislative intent of assisting students who need earnings to meet the cost of education. Since funds are provided first to States, then to institutions, and finally to students, distributions at all three levels must be considered in assessing a response to this question.

State Distributions

While the statutory distribution formula is complex, a comparison of the total WS distributions with the total number of full-time students in each State, indicated almost a perfect correlation (.994). However, when the average work-study distribution per full-time student was compared with a measure of student need (the mean Pell Grant eligibility index for the State), there was a low correlation (.10). Thus, State allocations are apparently not based on the financial need of students within States but, rather, on the number of students in States.

Institutional Distribution

Institutional data are not available. A review of the distribution formula outlined above under the Recipient Eligibility section suggests that institutional appropriations were based originally on the 1979-80 aggregate level of WS earnings required to meet educational costs. Recently, this approach has been modified and distributions to institutions are less likely to be representative of actual need.

Student Distributions [4]

Despite the fact that allotments to states are not correlated with financial need, distributions from institutions to students suggest that the intent of the legislation is being closely followed. The first measure is cost equity: funds are distributed consistently within college cost category regardless of income level. The second measure is whether increased participation rates occur within an income group regardless of cost. Average awards should also rise.

With regard to cost equity, a review of the Fall 1982 program participation for first time full time dependent students indicates that the share of WS earnings used to meet educational costs (percent of earnings divided by educational costs) is remarkably consistent across all income categories although the ratio decreases slightly at the most expensive institutions. In addition, the average award levels remained about the same across income categories and generally increased as costs increased. Thus, as defined, cost equity was achieved.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

With regard to income equity, program participation rates appear to be primarily related to family income averaging from 22 percent for the lowest income groups to 5 percent for the highest income level. This is consistent for all of college groups. In addition, the participation rates increase within an income group as the cost of education increases. Thus income equity as defined has also been achieved. Similar patterns can be observed for Fall 1982 for both cost equity and income, suggesting institutional equity is consistent over time.

With regard to the increased use of earnings as a means of meeting educational costs, we find that participation rates and the ratio of awards to costs, fell from 1980-81 to 1982-83 overall and in most cost/income categories. Mean dollar amounts increased, reflecting the increased need for WS earnings at a time of increasing costs and reduced employment opportunities. A slight reduction in participation rates, however, would be expected since the total appropriation for the two periods fell from $550 million (1979) to $528 million (1982)5/. The FY 1983 appropriation of $590 million should reverse this trend.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Work Study Program is considered an essential component of the Administration's package of student financial aid. To this end, an increase in funding has been proposed to assure that students would have adequate work opportunities to provide for their self help (work/loan) commitment in meeting educational costs.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

2. The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), University of California at Los Angeles, California, 1983.

3. The American Council on Education, "Student Financial Aid for Full Time Undergraduates", HEP Survey #60, Washington, D.C. 1983

4. U.S. Department of Education, A Review of the Distribution Formula for the College Based Programs, Unpublished study, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Table 3 provides a summary of the distribution of Work-Study recipients by family income, sex, and race; by average amount of Work-Study awards and the percentage of total students obtaining these awards. Overall, women have an 13 percent higher participation rate than men and blacks have a nearly 22 percent higher participation rate than whites. These variations differ, of course, by income categories.

Table 3

Participation in the WS Program By Sex for First Time, Full Time Dependent Students, Fall 1982

	$1- 5,999	$ 6,000 14,999	$15,000 24,999	$25,000 39,000	$40,000 AND UP	All
Male						
% Participating	22.1	19.8	15.1	10.3	4.7	11.6
Average Per Recipient	$ 705	$ 725	$ 748	$ 771	$814	$ 754
Female						
% Participating	22.5	21.7	18.1	12.4	4.5	13.7
Average Per Recipient	$ 668	$ 682	$ 714	$ 724	$735	$ 707
Black						
% Participating	22.3	15.8	16.5	20.1	4.0	15.2
Average Per Recipient	$ 770	$ 629	$ 811	$ 729	$700	$ 726
White						
% Participating	22.2	20.4	15.9	11.1	4.5	12.5
Average Per Recipient	$ 679	$ 690	$ 728	$ 734	$768	$ 720
All Students						
% Participating	22.3	20.9	16.6	11.3	4.6	12.7
Average Per Recipient	$ 684	$ 700	$ 730	$ 748	$778	$ 729

Source: Secondary Data Analysis of Cooperative Institutional Research Program - Fall 1982, OPBE/PES/SIAD

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

Studies in progress are:

1. The CIRP survey referred to in E.1 above provides annual data on distribution of aid from Federal student aid programs for first-time full-time freshmen. Data for the 1983-84 academic year will be available during Spring, 1984.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Coates, (202) 245-2320

Program studies: Dan Morrissey, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Work Study awards to students include both the Federal and the institutional portion. Mean awards may not be calculated by dividing the total federal appropriation by the number of participating students due to reductions in the total because of administrative cost allowances and transfer of funds.

2. The Work Study appropriation in FY 1983 consisted of a $540 million appropriation and a supplemental amount of $50 million authorized by Public Law 98-8 (sometimes known as the "Emergency Jobs Bill"). Since Public Law 98-8 represented an authorization external to the WS Program, no change in the WS authorization level was required.

3. Ten percent of the institution's Federal allocation may also be used to develop "Community Service Learning" programs which provide public service work study jobs related to the student's academic program. However, these programs have rarely been implemented.

4. WS earnings make up about one-fifth of all student earnings. It will not be possible to separate out the particular effect of this program on college going or college selection. Attention to this issue is included in the overview of Federal Postsecondary Education programs section.

5. The WSP program is forward-funded. Funds appropriated for a fiscal year are used in the next academic year. For example, FY 1982 appropriations were used during the academic year 1982-83.

UPWARD BOUND
(CFDA No. 84.047)

Highlights:

- The Administration proposed reducing funding for The Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 417A and 417C, Title IV of the Higher Education Act as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1a.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000
1980	200,000,000	147,500,000
1981	200,000,000	156,500,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000

Purpose: To generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school among low-income youths and potential first-generation college students. The goal of the program is to increase the academic performance and motivational levels of eligible enrollees so that they may complete secondary school and successfully pursue postsecondary education programs.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations, and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools.

Low-income individuals and potential first-generation college students who need academic support in order to successfully pursue a program of postsecondary education. Two-thirds of the participants must be low-income individuals or potential first-generation college students. Required low-income criteria are stated in application materials. Except for veterans, who can be served regardless of age, project participants must be between 13 and 19 years old and have completed the eighth grade but have not entered the twelfth grade (exceptions allowed).

Applicant Requirements: The standard application forms furnished by the Department of Education and required by OMB Circular No. A-102 must be used for this program. Proposals are to be developed in accordance with regulations, application and timetables issued by the Secretary of Education; no State plan is required. Requests for program applications should be made to the Division of Student Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. This program is subject to the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

Applicant Requirements: (Continued)

Federal staff and selected field readers evaluate new proposals on the basis of the selection criteria specified in 34 CFR 645.31 and 34 CFR 645.32.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: This program has no statutory formula or matching requirements. Three-year continuation awards are made to successful applicants.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports must be submitted on an annual basis in accordance with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- To provide technical assistance to prospective applicants for new Upward Bound grant awards by conducting application preparation workshops and developing and disseminating an application development guide.
- To implement procedures and standards for evaluating the prior experience of previously funded Upward Bound applicants.
- To issue approximately 440 new Upward Bound grant awards in the third quarter of fiscal year 1983.
- To respond to GAO's recommendations on assessing Upward Bound projects' success in meeting two important program goals: (1) increasing participants' academic skills; and (2) enabling participants to be successful in postsecondary education.
- To establish and administer grant monitoring procedures using a variety of cost-effective techniques (i.e., site visits, telephone monitoring, annual performance reports, audit reports, and individual project evaluation plans). These grant monitoring procedures would allow the Department to assess changes in project performance over time in order to consider requests for grants, as well as assess overall program accomplishments.
- To review existing Upward Bound regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.
- To implement the Secretarial Goals for 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- In response to GAO's recommendations on the Upward Bound Program, ED is considering amending the prior experience regulations for the Upward Bound Program in order to place more emphasis on the academic skills growth and postsecondary success of Upward Bound students when awarding new grants.
- In order to implement the Secretarial Goals for 1983, the Application Notice for the Upward Bound Program contained a section entitled "Suggestions for Fiscal Year 1983 Applicants for Upward Bound Funds." This section detailed six characteristics of successful program practices related to the Secretarial Goals.
- Application preparation workshops were conducted in five cities nationally for applicants for new Upward Bound grants. An application development guide was prepared and disseminated to all prospective applicants.
- Procedures and standards for assessing prior experience of previously funded Upward Bound applicants were developed, and prior experience points were assigned to 432 eligible applicants.
- 513 grant applications were received and processed. 423 applicants were issued grant awards for program year 1983-84.
- In response to GAO's recommendations, steps were taken to ensure that every Upward Bound application funded in FY 1983 contained objectives for measuring the academic skills growth of Upward Bound participants and for following up on Upward Bound graduates to determine their postsecondary success. For those applications without clear measurable objectives in the above areas, specific objectives were negotiated into the project work plan prior to funding.
- Given the shortage of resources available to monitor over 400 grants, a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: Grants are provided to participating institutions to provide educational services to disadvantaged youth.

Student benefits typically begin with a six to eight week residency and study on a college or secondary school campus. During the academic year the student may attend Saturday classes or tutorial/counseling sessions or participate in cultural enrichment activities. During the junior and senior years the student explores postsecondary options.

Program Scope: In FY 1983, 423 awards were made, at an average grant of $161,441. Thirty-two thousand participants were served at an average Federal cost of $2,134 per participant. Only new awards were made in FY 1983. Total program awards were $68,289,683.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: A 1979 evaluation of Upward Bound (E.2) provided the most comprehensive and scientifically accurate statistics about the program. These statistics were based on a national sample of more than 3,400 Upward Bound students in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades and a comparison group of about 2,000 similar students who did not participate in the program.

The following evaluation findings document the impact of the Upward Bound Program:

- Participation in Upward Bound (UB) brought those students to the 96 percent rate of high school completion, which is the national rate of completion.
- Upward Bound had a large positive influence on postsecondary entrance. About 91 percent of the typical UB participants entered some type of postsecondary education while about 70 percent of comparable nonparticipants entered.
- Upward Bound influences the types of institutions entered and the types of individuals who enter. Of the students that entered postsecondary education, about 73 percent of typical UB participants attended a four-year college or university. The comparable rate for nonparticipants was 50 percent. Indeed, 22 percent of the nonparticipants attended a vocational or technical school in comparison to 9 percent of typical UB participants.
- Overall, UB had a large positive effect on student persistence. Over all types of schools, typical UB participants maintain their enrollment for one or more terms than do comparable nonparticipants. Controlling for the type of school attended, UB participants persist slightly longer (i.e. one-fifth of a term) than comparable nonparticipants.
- Over all types of schools, typical UB participants earned more credits than comparable nonparticipants.
- The grades earned at postsecondary institutions by UB participants were roughly the same, or slightly lower, than those earned by comparable nonparticipants. At four-year colleges and universities, average UB participants and comparable nonparticipants earned grade point averages of about 2.0 (equivalent to a letter grade of C).

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

A management-oriented evaluation (E.3) of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students has recently been completed. A major purpose of this study was to interview policymakers, legislators, and program participants to determine their perceptions of the programs' goals and, if possible, to achieve consensus on the program objectives. There was general agreement about the following objectives for the programs:

- Project participants' motivation to complete secondary education will be enhanced and graduation rates will be increased.
- Application rates to postsecondary institutions by program participants will be increased.
- Project participants' knowledge of realistic postsecondary educational opportunities and financial aid availability will be increased.
- The number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance and the amount of financial aid received by a project will be increased.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

The Administration proposes to reduce funding for the Special Programs for the Disadvantaged and emphasize aid to the most disadvantaged persons.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983
2. Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A Second Follow-up Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 1979
3. Evaluability Assessment of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, CA, January 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

The latest data available indicate that 47 percent of the Upward Bound students were male and 53 percent female; 55 percent were black, about 14 percent of Hispanic origin, 24 percent white, and the rest Asian, Pacific Islander, or Native American.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies of this program are being conducted or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: James D. Ormiston, (202) 426-8960

Program Studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs.

TALENT SEARCH
(CFDA No. 84.044)

Highlights:

- The Administration proposes funding these activities at a reduced level. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 417A and 417B, Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[1]
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000
1980	200,000,000	147,500,000
1981	200,000,000	156,500,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000

Purpose: To identify qualified youths with potential for postsecondary education; to encourage them in continuing in and graduating from secondary school and in enrolling in programs of postsecondary education; to publicize the availability of student financial aid; and to increase the number of secondary and postsecondary school dropouts who reenter an educational program.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools.

Individuals residing in the target area or attending a target school who have potential for education at the postsecondary level and who need one or more of the services provided by the project. Two-thirds must be low-income individuals who are also potential first-generation college students. Project participants must be between 12 and 27 years old (exceptions allowed). Required low-income criteria for participants are stated in application materials.

Applicant Requirements: The standard application forms as furnished by the Department of Education and required by OMB Circular No. A-102 must be used for this program. Proposals must be developed in accordance with regulations, applications, and timetables issued by the Secretary of Education; no State plan is required. Requests for program applications should be made to the Division of Student Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. This program is subject to the provisions of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

Federal staff and selected field readers evaluate new proposals on the basis of the selection criteria specified in 34 CFR 643.31 and 34 CFR 643.32.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: This program has no statutory formula or matching requirements. Three-year continuation awards are made to successful applicants.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports must be submitted on an annual basis in accordance with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were:

- To issue noncompeting continuation grant awards to 167 Talent Search projects during the third quarter of fiscal year 1983.
- To establish and administer grant monitoring procedures using a variety of cost effective techniques (i.e., site visits, telephone monitoring, annual performance reports, audit reports, and individual project evaluation plans). These grant monitoring procedures will allow ED to assess both individual project performance over time in order to consider requests for grant renewals, as well as to assess overall program accomplishments.
- To develop and have approved a new performance reporting form for the Talent Search Program.
- To review existing Talent Search regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o The Talent Search Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final form in 1982. A file of suggestions for further deregulation and of policy questions is maintained.
- o 167 noncompeting continuation awards were issued (160 in the third quarter and 7 in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1983).
- o Given the shortage of resources available to monitor these grants, a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross program monitoring.
- o A new annual performance report form for the Talent Search Program was developed and approved for use in reporting project performance for the 1982-83 project year.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In FY 1983, 167 continuation awards were made for an average award of $102,108. Services were provided to an estimated 197,000 participants at an average cost per participant of $87. Total program awards were $17,057,989.

Program Effectiveness: An impact evaluation of this program has not been conducted. Program data for FY 1981 show that 66,239 clients were placed in postsecondary education with an additional 40,187 accepted but not yet enrolled. About 14,301 actual or potential dropouts were persuaded to return to school or college. (E.1)

A management-oriented evaluation of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students has recently been completed. The study was commissioned by the Department of Education and conducted by the American Institutes for Research (AIR). A major purpose of the study was to interview policymakers, legislators, and program participants to ascertain their perception of the program's goals and, if possible, to build a consensus so that agreed upon objectives for the program were established.

There was general consensus about the following program objectives:

- o Project participants' motivation to complete secondary education will be enhanced and graduation rates will be increased.
- o Application rates to postsecondary institutions by program participants will be increased.
- o Project participants' knowledge of realistic postsecondary educational opportunities and financial aid availability will be increased.
- o The number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance and the amount of financial aid received by projects will be increased. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposes to reduce funding for the Special Programs for the Disadvantaged and emphasize aid to the most disadvantaged persons.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983

2. Evaluability Assessment of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, January 1982

F. Other Supporting Data

In FY 1981, the latest year for which data are available, 153 projects provided services to about 200,000 clients. Of these, about 41 percent were black, 32 percent white, 20 percent Hispanic, and 7 percent other ethnic groups. About 56 percent were women, and 44 percent, men.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are being conducted or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: James D. Ormiston, (202) 426-8960

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

Notes:

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (up to FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY CENTERS
(CFDA No. 84.066)

Highlights:

- o The Administration proposed terminating these activities.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 417A and 417E, Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1c.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation[1]
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000
1980	200,000,000	147,500,000
1981	200,000,000	156,500,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000

Purpose: To provide information on financial and academic assistance available for qualifed adults desiring to pursue a program of postsecondary education and to assist them in applying for admission to institutions of postsecondary education.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and organizations and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools.

Adults residing in the target area who need one or more of the services provided by the project in order to pursue a program of postsecondary education and who desire to pursue or who are pursuing a program of postsecondary education. Two-thirds of the participants must be low-income individuals who are also first-generation, or potential first-generation, college students. Project participants must be at least nineteen years old (exceptions allowed). Required low-income criteria for participants are stated in application materials.

Applicant Requirements: The standard application forms as furnished by the Department of Education and required by OMB Circular No. A-102 must be used for this program. Proposals are to be developed in accordance with regulations, applications and timetables issued by the Secretary of Education; no State plan is required. Requests for program applications should be made to the Division of Student Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. This program is subject to the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

Federal staff and selected field readers evaluate new proposals based on the selection criteria established in program regulations. Grantees are selected on the basis of satisfactory proposals and availability of funds.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The Department of Education awards Educational Opportunity Center Program grants on a cost-sharing basis paying up to 75 percent of the cost of establishing and operating a center, to approved postsecondary institutions, and public and private agencies and organizations. Awards are forward-funded and are made competitively. Grants are three year continuation awards.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are required on an annual basis in accordance with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- To issue noncompeting continuation grant awards to 33 EOC projects during the third quarter of fiscal year 1983.

- To establish and administer grant monitoring procedures using a variety of cost-effective techniques (i.e., site-visits, telephone monitoring, annual performance reports, audit reports, and individual project evaluation plans). These grant monitoring procedures will allow ED to assess both individual project performance over time in order to consider requests for grant renewals and overall program accomplishments.

- To review existing EOC regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The EOC Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final in 1982. In addition, the Department reviewed the EOC regulations and clarified ED policy concerning EOC services to students enrolled in programs of postsecondary education.

- 33 noncompeting continuation awards were issued (32 in the third quarter and 1 in the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1983).

- Given the shortage of resources available to monitor these grants, a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.

- A new annual performance report form for the EOC Program was developed and approved for use in reporting project performance for the 1982-83 project year.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In fiscal year 1983, 33 continuation awards were made for an average award of $236,311. Services were provided to an estimated 105,600 participants at an average cost per participant of $75. Total program awards were $7,798,260.

Types of Benefits Provided: The Centers operate a recruiting effort to identify persons who need the program's services, to counsel them about opportunities for furthering their education, and to help them apply for admission and financial aid. The Centers also provide remedial and tutorial services to students enrolled or accepted for enrollment in postsecondary schools. 2/

Program Effectiveness: An impact evaluation of this program has not been conducted. However, program data for FY 1980 show that 33,021 participants were placed in postsecondary schools or other types of training programs, while another 8,078 participants were accepted by a postsecondary institution but had not begun their studies.

A management oriented study of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students (EOCs, UB, TS, SSDS) has recently been completed by the American Institutes for Research (AIR) under contract to the Department of Education. The major purpose of the study was to ascertain the perceptions of the program's goals by program managers and policymakers, legislators, and participants, and, if possible, to build consensus among those interviewed so that agreed-upon program objectives were established.

There was a general consensus by the above groups on the program's objectives. These include:

- To increase project participants' motivation to complete secondary education and enhance graduation rates.
- To increase application rates to postsecondary institutions by participants.
- To increase project participants' knowledge of realistic postsecondary educational opportunities and financial aid availability.
- To increase the number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance, and to increase the amounts of financial aid received by the project.
- To enhance participants' motivation to complete studies in a postsecondary institution. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposed to eliminate funding for this activity.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

2. Evaluability Assessment of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, January 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

In FY 1981, the last year data is available, 32 funded projects provided various forms of counseling and assistance to 127,198 participants.

I. Total participants by ethnicity.

American Indian	3,621	03%
Asian/Pacific Islands	4,645	04
Black	50,780	40
Hispanic	19,734	15
White	48,418	38
	127,198	100

II. Total participants by sex (FY 1980).

Men	49,831	41.2%
Women	71,110	58.8
TOTAL	120,941	100.0

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are being conducted or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: James D. Ormiston (202) 426-8960

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students: Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, Service Learning Centers (up to FY 1982), and the Training Program. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs.

2. Public Law 96-374 focused the Educational Opportunity Program on adults (at least nineteen years of age). Not less than two-thirds of the individuals participating in a project must be low-income and potentially first generation college students. The description presented reflects the program in academic year 1980-81.

SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS
(CFDA No. 84.042)

Highlights:

- o The Administration proposed reduced funding for these activities emphasizing aid to the most disadvantaged minority students. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 417A and 417D, Title IV of Higher Education Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1b.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000
1980	200,000,000	147,500,000
1981	200,000,000	156,500,000
1982	165,000,000	150,240,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000

Purpose: To identify qualified low-income, first generation college students or physically handicapped students who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment by institutions that are recipients of grants, and to provide supportive services for these students who are pursuing programs of postsecondary education.

Eligibility: Funds go to institutions of higher education to provide services to low-income, first-generation college students or physically handicapped students in need of academic support to successfully pursue a program of postsecondary education. At least two-thirds of the project participants must be physically handicapped or must be low-income individuals who are first-generation college students. The remaining participants must be either physically handicapped, low-income individuals, or first-generation college students. Required low-income criteria for participants are stated in application materials.

Award Criteria: Federal staff and selected field readers evaluate new proposals on the basis of the selection criteria; plan of operation; quality of key personnel; budget and cost effectiveness; evaluation plan; adequacy of resources; need for a special services project; likelihood of success; institutional commitment.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: This program has no statutory formula or matching requirements. Three-year continuation awards are made to successful applicants.

Obligation and Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports must be submitted on an annual basis in accordance with Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR).

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- To issue noncompeting continuation grant awards to 640 Special Services projects during the first quarter of fiscal year 1983.
- To establish and administer a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures (e.g., site-visits, telephone monitoring, annual perfomance reports, audit reports, and individual evaluation plans) which will allow ED to assess both individual project performance over time in order to consider requests for grant renewals, and overall program accomplishments.
- To develop and approve a new performance reporting form for the Special Services Program.
- To review existing Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- 639 noncompeting continuation grant awards were issued during the first quarter of fiscal year 1983.
- Given the shortage of resources available to monitor over 600 grants, a variety of cost-effective grant monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of annual performance reports and other data, and on-site cross-program monitoring.

B. Progress and Accomplishments: (continued)

- A new annual performance report form for the Special Services Program was developed and approved for use in reporting project performance for the 1982-83 project year. This form was developed in accordance with GAO recommendations on the data needed to assess the success of Special Services projects in meeting the program goals.

- The Special Services Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final in 1982. In addition, the Department reviewed the Special Services regulations concerning services to "physically handicapped" and determined that diagnosed learning disabled students may be served under the definition of physically disabled contained in the Special Services regulations.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits: Special Services is a discretionary grant program that makes awards to institutions of higher education to provide remedial or bilingual educational teaching, guidance, and/or counseling services for students with an educationally, culturally, or economically deprived background, or with a physical handicap or limited English-speaking ability. The program is forward-funded and no matching funds are required by the grantee institutions.

Program Scope: In FY 1983, 639 awards were made (continuation grants only) for an average award of $94,764. Projects served 150,000 participants at an average Federal cost per participant of $404. Total program awards were $60,554,119.

Program Effectiveness: The Systems Development Corporation has conducted an impact evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of the federally funded Special Services for Disadvantaged Students (SSDS) program as it existed during the 1979-80 academic year in postsecondary educational institutions across the country. The base-year report summarizes the SSDS program's short-term impact on freshman students who received special services from the program in that year. A follow-up survey, conducted in academic year 1982-83, attempted to determine longer-term program impact on the same sample of students, many of whom were then in their senior year in their colleges and universities. Findings from the base-year report are summarized below (E.1):

- Students who received the full range of SSDS services were 2.26 times more likely to complete the freshman year than similar students who did not receive such services.

- SSDS students attempted and completed more course units than did similar students who did not participate in these services.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

- SSDS students who had full-services had lower grade point averages in the first year than students who had more limited services. However, it is likely that this finding simply reflects the fact that students with poorer educational background and poorer entry skills tend to be given more services.
- Students receiving more financial aid are more likely to persist through their freshman year, and tend to attempt and complete more course units and to obtain higher grades, than comparable non participants in the program.
- Students having more affluent parents attempted and completed more course units and received higher grade point averages than SSDS students. However, student financial incentives (grants and tuition waivers) were apparently highly effective in offsetting some of the negative effects of poverty backgrounds for some SSDS students. Such incentives were stronger predictors of course units attempted and completed, and of grade point averages, than the level of parental income, at least within the income range found in this study.

The follow-up study, conducted on students who would normally be in their fourth-year of college, reported the following (E.5):

- Almost 60 percent of the SSDS participants were still enrolled three years after the initial freshman survey, and over half were full-time students.
- In general, students with freshman-year participation profiles representing moderate levels of services, e.g., a single type of academic service (tutoring, group instruction, academic counseling) or a combination of two types of services tended to show superior performance on three of the long-term outcome measures (time enrolled, and course units attempted and completed), compared with students who received no special services in their freshman year. However, only certain pairings of services and outcomes showed these relationships, and there was no clear evidence that one particular kind of service was superior to another.
- The freshman-year participation profiles representing the most intensive combinations of services showed no relationships with the long-term outcomes, or in certain cases, negative associations. One possible explanation is that the academic services were generally beneficial, but that the most intensive services were targeted toward students with the greatest learning deficiencies and were unable to overcome those deficiencies.
- Non-academic special services (orientation, cultural services, assessment, and referral) received either during the freshman year or later, are associated with more extended enrollment, greater numbers of course units attempted and completed, and higher grades achieved.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Academic special services received after the freshman year are associated with poorer long-term academic outcomes.

The General Accounting Office has recently completed a study of the Special Services program. The purpose of the review was to assess ED's administration of program operations to determine if the grantee projects were meeting program and project goals, and to determine the progress of students in the program. This review covered the fiscal years 1978, 1979 and 1980. The review is based on visits to eleven SSDS project (in six States) out of the 557 project grantees.

GAO findings were in large part consistent with findings from earlier studies in reporting that ED needs better assurance that program goals and project objectives are being met. Specifically, GAO reported the following findings (E.3):

- Only three of the eleven projects visited had specific objectives to increase retention and graduation rates.

- In most cases, project objectives described the types of services to be provided and the number of students to receive the services. Other objectives were stated in broad, unmeasurable terms.

- Assessments of local projects have not been made to determine whether project objectives are being met. Site visits are infrequent and too limited in scope.

- Local project reports to the SSDS program managers are not complete nor accurate; failure to obtain objectives is not reported.

As a result of these findings, the GAO made the following three recommendations:

- To better determine whether project objectives and program goals are being met, the Secretary should require project proposals to contain measurable objectives consistent with the program goal of increasing retention and graduation rates.

- The Secretary should require project monitoring visits to determine whether projects are meeting proposed objectives.

- The Secretary should require project annual performance reports to include information on the academic performance of participating students, and the status of all proposal objectives whether accomplished or not.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

A management-oriented evaluation (E.4) of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students has recently been completed. The major purpose of this study was to interview policymakers, legislators, and program participants to determine their perception of the program's goals, and if possible to establish consensus on the program's objectives. There was general agreement with the following program objectives:

- To increase project participants' knowledge of realistic postsecondary educational opportunities and financial aid availability.
- To increase the number of accurate applications from students for financial assistance, and to increase the amount received by the project.
- To enhance the program participants' motivation to complete studies in a postsecondary institution.
- To increase persistence in and completion of appropriate postsecondary programs for SSDS participants.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The Administration proposed to reduce funding for the Special Programs for the Disadvantaged and to target these funds on aid to the most disadvantaged, particularly minorities.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.
2. Evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program, final report, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1981.
3. "Report on the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program", November 12, 1982, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.
4. "Evaluability Assessment of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students", American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, CA, January 1982.
5. Follow-Up Evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program, draft final report, System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, CA, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

The latest data available, FY 1981, show that 57 percent of the program participants were female and 43 percent were male. About 38 percent of the participants were black and 40 percent of the participants were white, 14 percent of Hispanic origin, 5 percent Asian, and 3 percent Native American. Seven percent of the students were physically handicapped.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

A follow-up study to the 1981 evaluation of the SSDS program has been conducted. This evaluation assessed the longer-term impact of the program on the same student sample, many of whom were in their fourth year of college.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: James D. Ormiston (202) 426-8960

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for the five programs.

VETERANS' COST-OF-INSTRUCTION PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.064)

Highlights:

o The Administration proposes terminating these activities.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended; Title IV, Section 420; 20 U.S.C. 1070e-1.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$19,000,000
1980	"	14,380,000
1981	"	6,019,000
1982	12,000,000	4,800,000
1983	12,000,000	3,000,000

Purpose: To encourage colleges and universities to serve the special needs of veterans, especially Vietnam-era and disadvantaged veterans.

Eligibility: Nationally or regionally accredited institutions of higher education. Proprietary institutions (i.e., organized for profit) and schools or departments of divinity are not eligible.

Applicants must demonstrate and document either a 10 percent increase in undergraduate veteran enrollment in the year of application over the preceding academic year or that their veteran enrollment constitutes at least 10 percent of total enrollment. Only veterans who are (1) enrolled at least half-time in eligible institutions of higher education, and (2) recipients of benefits under Chapters 31 and 34 of Title 38, U.S.C. can be considered in the enrollment count.

Applicant Requirements: Applications, instructions, and assistance are provided by Veterans' Program Branch, Institutional Support Programs, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202. Apply to unit above using ED Form 424-269. This program is subject to the provisions of OMB Circular No. A-110.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: This program provides formula grants to institutions of higher education based on the number of veterans enrolled receiving veteran's educational or vocational rehabilitation services with bonus payments for enrolled veterans who are educationally disadvantaged or disabled. There are no matching requirements. Current legislation limits institutions' total award to $75,000. The payment factor is proportionately reduced to meet the limits of the funds available.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual fiscal and operational reports. Institutional audits, usually annually, but not less frequently than once every 2 years, shall be made available to the Secretary of Education. Recipient is required to maintain standard records.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Complete processing of all required reports (budgets, financial status and program performance reports).
- Visit at least one-third of the institutions funded and provide technical assistance as needed.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Applications for 1983-1984 funds were processed and awards made to 833 institutions of higher education.
- VCIP staff personnel participated in cross program monitoring activities and site visitations were conducted as scheduled.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The Veterans' Cost of Instruction (VCIP) program was created in 1972 . The peak year of veteran enrollment in postsecondary education was 1976 when there were approximately 910,000 enrolled veterans who were eligible for services under VCIP. By 1981, the number of eligible veterans had declined to 212,000, and projections indicate that eligible enrollment is likely to fall below 200,000 in 1983. (E.1)

Types of Benefits Provided: Institutions receiving VCIP funds must maintain a full-time Office of Veterans' Affairs and provide counseling and tutorial services, outreach and recruitment programs, and special education programs for veterans, with special emphasis on services for disabled or handicapped veterans, incarcerated veterans and educationally disadvantaged veterans.

The VCIP program is intended to provide improved and expanded services to veterans enrolled in institutions of higher education. The Program is neither a contract nor a grant, it is an entitlement program. An institution is entitled to a payment of $300 for each undergraduate veteran enrolled in the institution (Category I) and to a bonus payment of $150 for each enrolled veteran who has been the recipient of certain V.A. benefits designed to assist the educationally disadvantaged veteran (Category II).

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: No studies of program effectiveness have been conducted.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

- No funds were requested by the Administration for this program for due to the sharply declining number of Vietnam-era veterans.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

F. Other Supporting Data:

- None available.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

- No studies of this program are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: James Rogers, (202) 245-2806

Program Studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.116)

Highlights:

Fund projects in FY 1982 focused on national science and technology needs, teacher education, and the economy. (IIB)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title X of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1135 - 1135a-3).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 75,000,000	$13,000,000
1980	75,000,000	13,500,000
1981	20,000,000	13,500,000
1982	13,500,000	11,520,000
1983	13,500,000	11,710,000

Purpose: To provide assistance for innovative programs which improve access to and the quality of postsecondary institutions. The eight broad purposes for which grants and cooperative agreements may be awarded are:

1) Encourage the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education and provide equal educational opportunity for all;
2) Create institutions and programs that offer new paths to career and professional training and new combinations of academic and experiential learning:
3) Establish institutions and programs based on the technology of communications;
4) Carry out changes in internal structure and operations designed to clarify institutional priorities and purposes in postsecondary educational institutions;
5) Design and introduce cost-effective methods of instruction and operation;
6) Introduce institutional reforms designed to expand individual opportunities for entering and re-entering institutions and pursuing programs of study tailored to individual needs;
7) Introduce reforms in graduate education in the structure of academic professions and in the recruitment and retention of faculties;
8) Create new institutions and programs for examining and awarding credentials to individuals, and introduce reforms in current institutional practices related to credentials.

Purpose (Continued)

The Fund's major strategy is to solicit widely for exemplary, locally developed improvement proposals. Proposals are accepted from all forms of organizations and on all topics and strategies applicable to postsecondary education (except basic research). Various FIPSE grants competitions attract 20 to 40 proposals for each available award. This enables the grants to be made selectively to address the most widely felt problems and most broadly useful strategies. The applicant's ability to specify both the problem and strategy is meant to produce more locally useful proposals, a flexible indicator of emerging problems and opportunities nationally, and a minimal Federal role in setting the education agenda.

Types of Competitions: Small discretionary grants and contracts are awarded competitively to a variety of postsecondary institutions and agencies (including two-and four-year colleges, State education agencies, community based organizations, and other institutions concerned with education beyond high school). Awards are made for the following programs:

- Comprehensive Program - Under this program, over 95 percent of FIPSE's program funds support a variety of action-oriented improvement projects. Projects span the full range of postsecondary issues, including improvement in the quality of education, integration of education and work, initiation of partnerships between schools and businesses, and delivery of appropriate educational services to a variety of learners.

- Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program - Fiscal Year 1983 was the third year of this program. Jointly supported by the Carnegie Corporation and the Department, these grants enable educational practitioners to analyze important advances in postsecondary education and to make such advances known and available to a broader audience.

- Final Year Dissemination Grants - A small number of dissemination grants are supported for selected FIPSE projects in their final year so that they may disseminate information about their projects to other institutions.

Applicant Requirements: There is a two-stage proposal process for the Comprehensive Program. Preliminary proposals are submitted directly to the Fund. These five page documents state the problem to be addressed, provide a description of the proposed program, indicate an evaluation format and list a budget. Successful preliminary applicants are invited to submit final proposals.

Proposals are reviewed by field readers, by the Fund's staff and its director, by the Board of the Fund, and by appropriate Department officials. State postsecondary education commissions must be given an opportunity to comment on projects funded in their States.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The Fund supports both single year and multi-year projects. Grants are awarded on a 1-, 2-, and 3-year basis, with phasing of assistance as required.

The inclusion of some institutional funds is one of the criteria used in evaluating proposals but no specific matching rate is required by current legislation or regulation.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: The Fund requires periodic progress evaluation reports from grant recipients, as well as a final report upon termination of funding.

Compliance with standard Education Department audit requirements is required. Grant recipients are also expected to maintain standard financial records.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA (417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

In fiscal year 1983, the Fund began new projects through the Comprehensive Program and the Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program. Neither program limits its awards to specified Federal priorities, but both awarded grants congruent with Secretarial and Administration priorities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Fund's field responsive grants competitions are meant to serve as an early warning device of emerging problems and opportunities. The table below shows five areas which have been growing in size for some years, and which have now become a major part of the Fund's portfolio of projects.

Grants by Selected Topic Area, Fiscal Year 1983

Teacher Education	18 (9%)
Science and Mathematics	22 (11%)
Educational Technology	35 (18%)
Education and the Economy	16 (8%)
Graduate and Professional Education (but not teacher education)	21 (11%)

SOURCE: E.1.

Each of these areas has been singled out because it is an issue of rising concern among applicants; this list is illustrative rather than inclusive of all the themes addressed by grantees.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope

Since it was established in 1972, the Fund has supported over 1100 projects, (selected from over 25,000 proposals). The Federal Government's portion of this effort totaled less than $124 million over the 11 years, for projects located in all States and most of the outlying areas.

In FY 1983, 202 grants were awarded, including 75 new awards through the Comprehensive Program, 102 second and third year grants to projects begun through the Comprehensive Programs of 1981 and 1982, 13 Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Awards, and 12 Final Year Dissemination grants.

Of these grants, 62 percent went to individual institutions of higher education, while the remaining 38 percent of the awards were received by consortia of institutions, State agencies, professional associations and other forms of organizations involved in postsecondary education. (See Table 1)

The one area in which the Fund's portfolio has narrowed somewhat over the years is in the scope of topics. The extent of and reasons for this change are illustrated in Table 2: as the purchasing power of the Fund's budget has fallen, successive Administrations since the mid-70s have chosen to maintain the breadth and number of grants, trading off against grant size. The result is fewer projects of the largest size involving topics such as support of major institutional realignments and major statewide efforts.

Table 1

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
PROGRAM DATA FY 1983

	1983
Comprehensive Program	
New awards	75
Average award	64,267
Total	$4,820,000
Non-competing contributions	100
Average award	65,400
Total	$6,540,000
Final Year Dissemination	
Number of grants	12
Average award	$ 8,333
Total	$ 100,000
Mina Shaughnessy	
Number of grants	13
Average award	$ 26,923
Total	$ 350,000
TOTAL	$11,710,000

SOURCE: E.I.

Table 2

Funds for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Changes in Amounts of Comprehensive Program Grants

	1973	1977	1983
Average Grant:	$ 92,500	$ 72,500	$ 63,900
Maximum Grant:	375,000	188,616	166,000
% of Grants $100,000+:	31%	19%	8%

	1973	1977	1983
220-380,000	10%		
200-220,000	5%		
180-200,000	3%	2%	
160-180,000	2%	1%	1%
140-160,000	6%	0%	1%
120-140,000	3%	2%	1%
100-120,000	6%	5%	5%
80-100,000	7%	15%	21%
60- 80,000	9%	22%	26%
40- 60,000	42%	23%	24%
20- 40,000	8%	17%	16%
0- 20,000	2%	4%	4%
TOTAL:	98%*	101%*	99%*

Source: E.2. *Rounding errors

Note: Figures are in nominal dollars and not adjusted for inflation.

Table 3

Distribution of Awards FY 1982 - FY 1983
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
(In Thousands of dollars)

	1982 Actual	1983 Estimate **
Applications received:	2,790	2,940
# of Grants by institutional type:		
two-year public	17	17
two-year private	3	2
four-year public	79	68
four-year private	42	43
other (including consortia, and public and private organizations)	64	65
Total	205	195 **
Historically Black Colleges	6	5
Funds to:		
two-year public	$ 1,004	1080
two-year private	$ 115	141
four-year public	$ 4,222	4078
four-year private	$ 2,034	2221
other	$ 4,419	3781
Total *	$11,710	$11,301 **
Historically Black Colleges	$255	$306
Average award to:		
two-year public	$59	$64
two-year private	$52	$70
four-year public	$53	$60
four-year private	$48	$52
other	$69	$58
Total	$58	$58
Historically Black Colleges	$43	$61

*Includes funds transferred from DOL in 1982 and funds granted to FIPSE by the Carnegie Corporation in 1982 and 1983.

**At the time this table was constructed 195 of an eventual 202 grants, and $11,301,000 of $11,710,000 had been awarded.

Source: E.I.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Program Effectiveness: A Fund-commissioned study has been completed recently which focused on the institutionalization and adoption of the Fund's Comprehensive Grant Programs. This study was a partial replication and extension of a study of the Fund which was completed earlier (see prior Annual Evaluation Reports for the major findings of the earlier study). (Source E.2.) The current study used only two criteria: the current rate of project institutionalization, and the current extent to which Fund-supported projects influence others.

Specific results of the later study include:

- Eighty-eight percent of the sampled projects continued to exist after their grants ended. This continuation rate is greater than the 78 percent found in the previous evaluation.
- Eighty-eight percent of the projects that have been completed for at least two years still exist, and 82 percent have become institutionalized (that is, they report that they will still provide at least the same level of service or activity). This rate of institutionalization is much higher than the rate of 55 percent found in the previous evaluation.
- Eighty-one percent of the existing projects report that they provide at least the same level of service or activity as they did when they were recipients of the Fund. Again, this compares favorably with earlier findings in which 73 percent of the continuing projects met this criterion.
- The rate of project institutionalization is not affected by the absence of the original project director.
- The Fund's projects influence a large number of other people and organizations. Thus, it is estimated that the Fund has received an additional return on its investment of more than 200 percent.
- A reassessment of the data collected in the previous evaluation, in light of the more current research, indicates that approximately 10,000 persons or organizations were influenced by the Fund's projects between 1973-1979.
- About 60 percent of the influenced parties were within the same region as the grantee, thus the cross-regional fertilization of ideas was somewhat weak.
- The cross-fertilization of ideas across institutional types is even weaker than it is across regions.
- Projects were not able to expand to the extent that earlier projects had. Of those projects still in existence following the end of Fund support, only 31 (39 percent) have increased, whereas over half of the projects studied previously had expanded.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No changes are contemplated, except that appropriation language has been proposed which will require grant recipients to match a portion of the Federal funds they receive. The Administration believes that this strategy, recognizing the benefits accruing to grantees, will also help to reduce Federal spending and require institutions to be fully committed to projects that they wish to undertake.

E. Supporting Studies Cited in Section C Above

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, 1983.

2. "Evaluation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education," Draft Final Report, Sol Pelavin Associates, Washington, D.C., 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

See Table 1. No other data available.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No additional studies are planned or are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Stephen C. Ehrmann, (202) 245-8100

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. See FY 1982 Annual Evaluation Report for details of the results of earlier studies.

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS
STAFF AND LEADERSHIP PERSONNEL
(CFDA No. 84.103)

Highlights:

o No funds were requested for this program in the President's budget for this program.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 417A and 417F, Title IV of the Higher Education Act, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1070d, 1070d-1d.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization 1/	Appropriation 1/
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000
1980	200,000,000	147,500,000
1981	200,000,000	156,500,000
1982	165,000,000 2/	150,240,000
1983	170,000,000	154,740,000

Purpose: To provide training for staff and leadership personnel who are employed in Special Services, Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Educational Opportunity Centers programs. Training for local project personnel is designed to improve their skills in leadership, management, academic instruction and counseling.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and non-profit private agencies and organizations are eligible for grants. Participations may include leadership personnel, full- and part-time staff, and individuals preparing for employment as staff or leadership personnel in projects under the Special Programs.

Applicant Requirements: Federal staff and selected field readers evaluate new proposals on the basis of the following selection criteria: plan of operation; quality of key personnel; budget and cost effectiveness; evaluation plan; adequacy of resources; need for a training project.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: This program has no statutory formula or matching requirements. One-year grants are forward-funded and must begin by September of the next year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports must be submitted on an annual basis.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- o To consult with regional and state professional associations that have persons with special knowledge with respect to training needs of the Special Programs.
- o To implement procedures and standards for evaluating the prior experience of previously funded Training Program applicants.
- o To issue approximately 10 new Training Program grants during the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1983.
- o To establish and administer grant monitoring procedures using a variety of techniques (i.e., site-visits, telephone monitoring, annual performance reports, and individual project evaluation plans) which will allow ED to assess both individual project performance in order to consider requests for grant renewals, as well as to assess overall Training Program accomplishments.
- o To review existing Training Program regulations and policies to determine if changes should be recommended and implemented.
- o To publish funding priorities for the Training Program based on the Secretarial Goals for 1983.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- o In order to implement the Secretarial Goals for 1983, the Application Notice of the Training Program contained a section entitled "Funding Priorities for Fiscal Year 1983." This section detailed five Secretarial priorities for FY 1983 Training Program grants. Those applicants addressing any one of these priorities were given extra point consideration during the evaluation process.
- o Public comments on training needs for Special Programs staff and leadership personnel were solicited at an open meeting held in Washington and through the NPRM on the Funding Priorities for fiscal year 1983, published in the Federal Register.
- o Procedures and standards for assessing prior experience of previously funded Training Program applicants were developed, and prior experience points were assigned to 11 eligible applicants.
- o 62 grants applications were received and processed. Twelve applicants were issued grant awards for program year 1983-84.
- o A variety of monitoring procedures were implemented. These included extensive telephone monitoring, reviews of reports and other data, and five on-site visits.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

o The Training Program regulations were developed under the regulation reform policies and procedures and were published in final form in 1982. As a result of recent grant competitions, ED is considering revising the Selection Criteria section of these regulations in order to better evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a proposed training program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In FY 1983, as in FY 1982, $959,700 was awarded to institutions. This amount funded 12 grants each averaging $79,975. Funding at this level will finance 1500 participants at an average cost of $640 per person. (E.1.)

Types of Benefits Provided: The Training Program awards contracts to support the operation of short-term training institutes and in-service training programs to improve the skills of staff and leadership personnel.

Program Effectiveness: No formal studies of this program have been conducted. However, a recently completed management oriented evaluation of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students, while not assessing the Training Program per se, found that many SPDS project personnel expressed a major need for more and better training in such diverse areas as: the most effective techniques for educating and motivating disadvantaged students; possible techniques for augmenting Federal project budgets by obtaining private sector assistance; the "key elements" of successfully managing a project; and possible techniques for involving parents and community groups more effectively in implementing successful outreach efforts. (E.2.)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

The Staff Training program was proposed for elimination.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.
2. Evaluability Assessment of the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students, American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, California, January 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: James D. Ormiston, (202) 426-8960

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Represents budget authority and appropriation for all Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students. Funds are not appropriated separately for these programs.
2. Beginning in FY 1982 the Training Program became a discretionary grant program instead of a contract program.

INSTITUTIONAL AID PROGRAMS
(CFDA No. 84.031)

Highlights:

- o A recently completed study of 51 participating institutions provides first in-depth knowledge of successful institutions with HEA III funded program activities. (See Section II.C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: HEA of 1965, Title III, as amended by Public Law 89-329 and Public Law 96-374; U.S.C. 1051-1069c.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	120,000,000	120,000,000
1980	120,000,000	110,000,000
1981	120,000,000	120,000,000
1982	129,600,000[3]	134,416,000[1]
1983	129,600,000[3]	134,416,000[2]

Purpose: To assist institutions of higher education with limited financial resources who serve significant percentages of low-income students to improve their academic programs, institutional management, fiscal stability, and student services with the ultimate objective of institutional self-sufficiency.

Eligibility: Developing institutions for FY 1982 were defined in the legislation as institutions of higher education which: (1) provide an educational program which awards an A.A. or a B.A. degree; (2) are accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or making reasonable progress toward such accreditation; (3) have satisfied both of the above requirements during the five academic years preceding the academic year during which program assistance would be provided--with the exception that the five-year stipulation may be waived by the Secretary for institutions which serve to increase the amount of higher education available to Indians, Spanish-speaking, rural, black or low-income students; (4) admit as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a high school providing secondary education or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate; and (5) are public or non-profit.

Applicant Requirements: The institutional aid program is available only to those institutions which serve significant percentages of low-income students and have limited financial resources. Each year, the Education Department publishes in the Federal Register a set of eligibility tables that the institution must use to determine its eligibility. An institution must meet or exceed a minimal score based on these tables to obtain eligibility. There are different tables for 2-year public, 2-year private, 4-year public, 4-year private, graduate only-private and graduate only-public institutions. There are 3 separate programs, Part A (Strengthening Institutions), Part B (Special Needs) and Part C (Challenge Grant). There are separate criteria for Part A and Part B. Those eligible for Part A or Part B are automatically eligible under Part C. Graduate-only institutions may be eligible for Part C only.

The Part A program uses 3 eligibility criteria; high average Pell awards per recipient, high percentage of Pell recipients per full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment, and low Educational and General Expenditures (E and G) per FTE. Once an institution is designated as eligible to apply, a proposal needs to be submitted and rated. If the proposal is highly rated, an institution may receive a one-year planning grant, a renewable grant not to exceed 3 years or a non-renewable grant for 4 to 7 years in duration. Not less than 24% of the money must be reserved for 2-year schools.

The Part B program uses three eligibility criteria, high Pell and campus-based awards per award recipient, high percentage of campus-based and Pell recipients per FTE, and low E and G per FTE. Once an institution is designated eligible, its proposal is rated. If the proposal is highly rated, an institution may be eligible for a one-year planning grant or a nonrenewable grant not to exceed 5 years. The government will share cost from the third to fifth year of the grant at a declining rate (90%, 80%, and 70%). Not less than 30 percent of the money is reserved for two-year schools. Fifty percent of the amount received by Historically Black colleges in 1979 or $27,035 million, is reserved for Historically Black Colleges.

An institution may be eligible for both Part A and Part B but cannot be funded by both programs.

For the Challenge Grant program, institutions establish eligibility under Part A or Part B or under special tables for graduate only institutions. Challenge Grants can be used for the same activities as funded under Part A and Part B. An institution must match 50% of the funds in commitments from non-Federal sources. An institution may receive a Challenge Grant and a nonrenewable grant from Part A or Part B. Challenge Grants are nonrenewable.

In addition, Congress enacted the Challenge Grant Amendments in 1983. This amendment initiates a new endowment program under Part C. The initial grants will be awarded in Fy 1984. It provides for federal matching of institutionally raised endowment funds.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance:

Table 1 outlines the duration and phasing of assistance for each part.

Table 1
Types of Awards

Part A	Maximum Number of Years	Percent Institutional Cost Share	Renewable[1]
Planning Grant	1	0	Yes
Renewable	3	0	Yes
Nonrenewable	7	0	No
Part B			
Planning Grant	1	0	Yes
Nonrenewable	5	0,0,10,20,30[2]	No
Part C	5	50	No

1. Renewable means may receive another Title III grant. Only one planning grant may be obtained.

2. Cost share required in 3rd, 4th, and 5th year of grant.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Reports as required by grant monitors. Records must be retained for 5 years after the end of the fiscal year the grants were awarded.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Fulfill the Department's obligation to evaluate Education Department programs by evaluating Title III.
- Provide technical assistance and review of on-going projects.
- Notify applicants by June 30 for Parts A and B of funding status.
- Maintain the Department's commitment to Historically Black colleges.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- A study completed of 51 participating institutions.
- Visited only institutions in serious trouble since resources for site visits has been limited in recent years.
- Met all legislated deadlines.
- Made 36 awards, a significant number, to Historically Black colleges.

C. Cost, Benefits and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits:

The Title III program was originally established to provide assistance to Historically Black Colleges or other institutions with similar problems. The Administration looks to this program as an important source of funding for Black Colleges.

The Strengthening Institutions Program (Part A) provides one-to-three year renewable grants and four-to-seven year non-renewable grants. At least 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this program must be used for non-renewable grants. A minimum of 24 percent of the funds must be awarded to two-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or allowable faculty development, curriculum, special services or management improvement activities.

The Special Needs Program (Part B) provides non-renewable one-to-five year grants. Historically Black colleges and universities must receive no less than one-half of the funds which they received under Title III in fiscal year 1979, or $27,035,000. A minimum of 30 percent of the funds under this program must be awarded to community or two-year institutions. Funds may be used for planning or allowable faculty development, curriculum, special services or management improvement activities.

The Challenge Grants Program (Part C) provides eligible institutions with a one-time grant for one-to-five years on a 50-50 matching basis. Funds may be used for the same activities as under Part A and B above.

The Endowment Grant Program provides eligible institutions a government match of institutionally raised endowment funds.

Program Scope: In FY 1982 Congress appropriated $134,416,000 (includes a $10.0M supplemental) and directed the Department to move $300,000 from Part B to Part A to fund two colleges in Vermont. Carry-on authority of funds was granted to select more institutions that had high scores but were unable to receive a grant award because of lack of funds.

In addition, Congress directed ED to hold a special competition for Historically Black colleges in order to obligate all the funds set-aside for these institutions and to conduct a separate competition of $5.0M for institutions that had an enrollment of at least 45% Hispanic and Native American students.

The 1982 obligations were made in phases. The initial obligations were made before passage of the supplemental appropriation of 1982 and assumed a funding reduction as specified in that year's continuation appropriation.

Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown on the distribution of awards by Part for each major minority group and by institutional type and control in FY 1982. Table 3 provides the distributions for FY 1983, but only by Part.

Table 2
Fiscal Year 1982 Obligations
(000)

Fiscal Year 1982	A	B	C	TOTAL
Appropriation*	$65,400	$64,800	$9,216	$134,416
Obligations	$64,589	$60,352	$7,896	$132,838
New Projects	277	186	45	508
Continuations	0	0	0	0
Historically Black				
Projects	27	49	10	86
Obligations	$10,597	$26,605	$4,220	$ 41,422
Native American or Asian (or Asian Pacific)				
Projects	8	8	0	16
Obligations	$ 1660	$ 2,227	0	$ 3,887
Hispanic**				
Projects	22	2	0	24
Obligations	$ 5,416	225	0	$ 5,641
4-year private				
Projects	93	70	22	185
Obligations	$21,271	$25,800	$2,402	$ 49,474
4-year public				
Projects	48	33	10	91
Obligations	$14,979	$14,771	$1,779	$ 31,528
2-year private				
Projects	14	12	6	32
Obligations	$ 2,528	$ 2,598	$ 405	$ 5,531
2-year public				
Projects	122	71	6	199
Obligations	$25,811	$17,184	$ 710	$ 43,704
Med. School	0	0	$2,600	$ 2,600

Source: E.1

*5 million supplemental was added without regard to the parts.

**3 of these institutions received additional funds from 1983 for their initial grant.

Table 3
FY 1983 Authority
(000)

Descriptive Measures	1983
Part A - Strengthening Program	
Planning grants	
Number of awards	11
Average of award	$ 25
Federal cost	$ 275
One-to-three year grants	
Number of awards	120
New	31
Continuations	89
Average award	$ 133
Federal cost	$ 16,000
Four-to-seven year grants	
Number of awards	146
New	---
Continuations	146
Average award	$ 316
Federal cost	$ 46,133
Part B--Special Needs	
One-to-five year grants	
Number of awards	173
New	14
Continuations	159
Average award	$ 361
Federal cost	$ 62,408
Part C	
Challenge Grants:	
Number of awards	56
New	14
Continuations	42
Average award	$ 171
Federal cost	$ 9,600
PROGRAM TOTAL:	
Number of awards	506
Total cost	$134,416

Source: E.1

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness: Until recently there has never been a study of the Institutional Development program that was able to determine the impact of Title III funds on institutional development at the activity level (i.e., faculty development, curriculum improvement, etc.). Such a study was completed in 1983. It is too long to detail specific activities, but findings from the study do provide great insight as to the real and potential success for the program as a whole. In institutions making successful use of Title III funds, the President was personally involved in the project from the beginning. HEA III program rules and regulations were also strictly followed. Time was also given to allow for the development activity to bear fruit. There were few activities observed that could be certified as successful on the institution's terms or with regard to HEA III program intent after only a year or two of development or that become operational and clearly self-supporting in that time. The study also indicated that the elements that go into making a successful program take some time to be effectively coordinated. This development process is new to Title III institutions, but not to other postsecondary education institutions.

The basic anomaly in the program at this point, say the researchers, is that the Title III activities generally have greater impact in the more advanced institutions. However, the less advanced institutions face the greater problems. The general observation is that most institutions (in the study) appear to have come a long way since 1966 and Title III certainly was one of the major contributing factors. However, Federal program managers need to become more sensitive to the sometimes less obvious needs of less developed institutions. In this regard, the study offers a number of suggestions. These will be outlined in two special workbooks. One for distribution to the participating institutions and the other to be made available to program managers. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The FY 1984 funding level was $134,416,000. Appropriation language was proposed to ensure funding for Historically Black colleges at a level of not less than $45,741,000, an increase of $4,921,000 above the 1983 revised estimate. In addition, $88,675,000 was available for all other institutions.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

2. Davis, Junius; Ironside, Roderick; and Van Sant, Jerry, The Anatomy of Institutional Development for Higher Education Institutions Serving Students from Low Income Backgrounds, Research Triangle Institute, October 1983

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

An evaluation of 51 Title III recipients was recently completed. No new studies are planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: William Butts, (202) 245-2715

Program studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Includes a $10,000,000 supplemental
2. Includes a $4,816,000 supplemental from passage of the 1983 supplemental appropriation bill.
3. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 lowered the authorization level to $129,600,000 while the supplemental budget actions effectively raised the authorization for FY 1982 and FY 1983.

MINORITY INSTITUTIONS SCIENCE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.120)

Highlights:

- A recent study of ten participating institutions indicated an improvement in the quality of their science programs. (II-C)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Section 3(a)(1), National Science Foundation Act of 1950 as enacted by Public Law 81-507, 64 Stat. 149 as amended, (42 (U.S.C. 1862); Section 515(d) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (20 U.S.C. 1221e-16(2) note).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$5,000,000	$5,000,000
1980	5,000,000	5,000,000
1981	5,000,000	5,000,000
1982	5,000,000	4,800,000
1983	5,000,000	4,800,000

Purpose: To assist institutions in improving the quality of preparation of their students for graduate work or careers in science, and access of undergraduate minority students to careers in the sciences, mathematics and engineering. To improve access for pre-college minority students in careers in science and engineering through community outreach programs conducted through eligible minority colleges and universities. To improve the capability of minority institutions for self-assessment, management, and evaluation of their science programs and dissemination of their results.

Eligibility: Private and public accredited 2- and 4-year institutions of higher education whose enrollments are predominantly (50 percent or more) American Indian; Alaskan Native; Black, not of Hispanic origin; Hispanic; Pacific Islander; or any combination of these or other disadvantaged ethnic minorities who are underrepresented in science and engineering. Proposals may also be submitted by non-profit science-oriented organizations, professional scientific societies, and all non-profit accredited colleges and universities which will render a needed service to a group of MISIP-eligible institutions or provide in-service training for project directors, scientists or engineers from eligible minority institutions.

Applicant Requirements: Institutions must provide the information necessary to establish their eligibility for participation in MISIP. The data on enrollment furnished to the Office for Civil Rights to satisfy requirements for the "Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education" are acceptable. Proposals must be signed by the project director(s), the relevant department head(s), and by an authorized official. The Department suggests that some institutional contribution be included as part of program support. However, by law, the program has no matching requirements.

Duration and Level of Assistance: The duration and maximum grant depends on which of the four grants the institution receives. The Institutional and Cooperative grants, which have a maximum duration of 3 years and a maximum award size of $300,000, are for comprehensive science education projects at a single institution or a consortium of institutions. The Design grants, to provide science planning capability, have a maximum duration of one year and award size of up to $20,000. The Special grants, with a maximum duration of two years and maximum award size of $150,000, are available for improvement activities in science and engineering programs, development of pre-college enrichment activities or any other activities designed to address specific barriers to the entry of minorities into science, mathematics, and technology fields.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: The program requires interim reports from directors of projects having a duration of more than 1 year at the end of each academic year's activities. A substantive technical report is required upon completion of the project for all funded projects.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- Complete processing of grant applications within 6 months of closing notice.
- Maintain Department's commitment to Minority Institutions.
- Provide participants with technical assistance and conduct audit reviews.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Grant processing was completed in a timely manner.
- Funding was requested for FY 1984.
- Insufficient money was provided for site visits needed to make audit reviews and provide technical assistance.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: Awards made in FY 82 and FY 83 were similar (Table 1). Most of the funds expended were for Institutional, Cooperative or Special grants totaling approximately $4.7 million or 98% of the total in FY 1983. The 14 Institutional and 2 Cooperative grants were the largest, averaging over $211,000 and $264,000 respectively, while the 20 Special grants, averaged over $59,000 and the 3 Design grants over $18,000 for the same period.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (continued)

Table 1

Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program

Award Type		Institutional	Cooperative	Design	Special
Maximum Size		$ 300,000	$300,000	$20,000	$ 150,000
Maximum Duration		3	3	1	2
FY 82 Award	dollars	$3,158,400	$490,558	$39,260	$1,100,518
	number	14	2	2	20
	average	$ 225,600	$245,279	$19,630	$ 55,026
FY 83 Award	dollars	$2,963,656	$527,232	$55,210	$1,188,392
	number	14	2	3	20
	average	$ 211,690	$263,616	$18,403	$ 59,420

SOURCE: E.1

Program Effectiveness: A program evaluation was conducted by Arthur D. Little Inc. in 1979. It concluded that MISIP has been successful in assisting institutions develop capability enhancing activities in these science programs. Also it stated that participating institutions reported increases in the number of sponsored science research projects conducted by science faculty. (E.2)

ESR Research Associates visited ten participating institutions. They found that the MISIP effort has been of considerable value in improving the quality of the science departments in most of the institutions. In particular, the program increased the number and quality of faculty, increased the percentage of students majoring in science, and enhanced the research capabilities of those science departments. However, the science education outcomes were not uniform. Instruction was improved when it included acquisition of permanent laboratory equipment. Faculty retention is most likely to be enhanced by improving the institutions' programs as a whole rather than in faculty development, which is more likely to help the faculty member find another position. (E.3)

Staff analysis of the interim and final participant reports reveal that over 70% of the grant-initiated activities have been institutionalized. In some cases institutional records were sufficient to assess the program, but the program should be better documented by the institution so that the performance of this program can be assessed better. (E.1)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Program priorities will focus upon upgrading the quality of instruction in mathematics and science in minority institutions and providing access for minority students to pursue careers in science and engineering.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

2. Arthur D. Little, Inc., Evaluation of Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program, Prepared for the National Science Foundation (No. C-79691) February 1979.

3. ESR Research Associates, The Minority Institution Science Improvement Program, Ten Case Study Assessments. January 5, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

The purpose of this program is to improve science, mathematics and technology education at predominately minority institutions. As Table 2 indicates, 164 out of 260 eligible institutions (63%) participated in the program through FY 1983.

Table 2

Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP)
Institutional Participation in MISIP, FY 1972-83

Predominant Minority Group	Number Eligible a/	Number of Awards	Number of Different Institutions Receiving Awards b/
Alaskan Native	4	2	1
American Indian	25	20	15 b/
Black	158	211	109 b/
Mexican American	16	12	8
Puerto Rican	25	33	16
Micronesian	2	3	1
Combination	30	26	14 b/
TOTAL	260 a/	309	164 b/

a/ Does not include 34 institutions whose eligibility/accreditation is uncertain or which are non-accredited.

b/ Includes nine non-accredited American Indian institutions, and one Hawaiian institution not included in the current eligibility pool count.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies are in progress or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Argelia Velez Rodriguez, (202) 426-9313

Program studies: Jim Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.097)

Highlights:

- No funds were requested for this program in the President's budget (II.D).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IX, Part E 20 U.S.C. 1134n-1134p.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$7,500,000	$2,000,000
1980	7,500,000	4,000,000
1981	5,000,000	3,000,000
1982	1,000,000	960,000
1983	1,000,000	605,000

Purpose: To establish or expand programs in accredited law schools in order to provide clinical experience to students in the practice of law.

Eligibility: Individual accredited law schools and a combination or consortium of accredited law schools.

Application Requirements: Instructions and forms detailing application procedures are mailed to all accredited law schools. Proposals are submitted to the Department of Education for a national competition. They are reviewed by a panel of outside consultants who make recommendations for funding to the Secretary. Panels are made up of faculty from law schools and attorneys in private practice.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are usually for one year and are forward funded.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Each successful applicant is required to share at least 10 percent of the total cost of the clinical law program. Yearly reports on program activities are also required. Audits may be required. Therefore, records are to be available for five years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983, the major aim has been to encourage institutions to continue programs in the absence of Federal funding.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

There is evidence that the program will continue in the absence of Federal support. For example, the Ford Foundation-sponsored Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR) has spent approximately $7 million over the past ten years to support approximately 100 clinical legal education programs. Information from the program files also indicates that law schools are making a greater financial commitment to clinical education by including clinics in their regular budgets and are providing tenure-positions to clinical professors. They are awarding academic credit to students who participate in clinics. (E.1)

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Students Served: During academic year 1982-1983, it is estimated that about 1200 law students benefited from a supervised clinical experience supported by the 40 project grants. The great majority of these students gained legal experience in the preparation and trial of actual cases, including administrative cases and the settlement of suits outside the courtroom, by providing real services, under supervision, to actual clients.

Types of Benefits Provided: Law School Clinical Experience program funds primarily support expanded in-house supervision of students engaged in clinical experience. In addition, support allows institutions to develop and expand their curriculum in this area.

Program Scope: For academic year 1982-83, $960,000 was awarded from fiscal year 1982 funds to support clinical legal education programs at 40 law schools. The average grant was about $24,000. Academic year 1983-84 grant award amounts will be similar. (E.1)

Program Effectiveness: Since the program was first funded in FY 1978, 109 law schools have received $11.5 million in support for their clinical legal education program. These grants have enabled law schools to:

1. Develop new areas of clinical experience and incorporate them in law school curriculum.

2. Increase the participation of law school faculty in the supervision of students in clinical legal education programs.

3. Provide appropriate and improved supervision of students enrolled in clinical programs.

4. Increase the number of students participating in clinical programs.

5. Improve skills of law students in interviewing witnesses, investigation and analysis, counseling clients, negotiating compromises, drafting documents, advocating before legal decisionmakers, and training in professional responsibility.

6. Develop appropriate plans to assume the entire costs of these programs absent Federal funding. (E.1)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

The need for clinical legal education appears to have been adequately demonstrated as programs are being supported at most of the Nation's accredited law schools, therefore the Administration plans to terminate this program. If the institutions continue to consider the programs valuable, they will support the operations of the programs, possibly with support from the community or other private sector groups.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Alan Schiff, (202) 245-2347

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

LEGAL TRAINING FOR THE DISADVANTAGED
(CFDA No. 84.136)

Highlights:

- o No funds were requested for this program in the President's budget for this program because it has obtained sufficient visibility to attract private funding. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IX, Part D; 20 U.S.C. 1134l-1134m.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization[1]	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	$1,000,000
1980	Indefinite	1,000,000
1981	$5,000,000	1,000,000
1982	$1,000,000	960,000
1983	1,000,000	1,000,000

Purpose: To assist persons from disadvantaged backgrounds to undertake training in the legal profession. The program was originally funded and administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO).

Eligibility: Public and private agencies and organizations other than institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for grants or contracts under this program. A noncompetitive project grant is awarded annually to the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO) to administer the program.

Applicant Requirements for Participants: Applications are submitted to the Council on Legal Education Opportunity (CLEO) which conducts an initial screening of applicants. Applications deemed eligible are forwarded to regional panels of law school deans and educators who make the final selections.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Students: Intensive six-week training session in the summer prior to law school and annual stipends of $1000 for the three years of law school. Annual grant awards are made to the Council on Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO) for distribution.

Obligations of Participants: Participating law schools file annual reports to the CLEO. No audits are required. The reports are maintained by CLEO.

The law schools are expected to absorb more than half the costs of the summer institutes and provide tuition scholarships, as well as other forms of financial aid to CLEO students. It has been estimated that the annual Federal support for CLEO generates as much as $3,000,000 in cash and services annually from the law schools.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During fiscal year 1983 the program objectives were:

- To redress the substantial underrepresentation of minority and economically disadvantaged groups within the legal profession.
- To serve those persons who aspire and are qualified to enter the legal profession but because of substantial economic deficiency and marginal admissions credentials may be unable to gain admission to law school under prevailing standards.
- To provide these students with the opportunity for law school matriculation via the operation of summer institutes and the provision of annual fellowships.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Support through this program has enabled the Council on Legal Education Opportunity, in concert with participating law schools, to:

- Conduct an active and aggressive effort to identify prospective law students in need of services provided by the program.
- Plan and conduct seven annual regional institutes across the country to provide intensive pre-law training to students in the summer prior to their entrance into law school.
- Insure that these six week summer institutes include an in-residence, intensive study program in legal analysis and law development and emphasize abstract thinking, legal research and legal writing techniques.
- Evaluate each student at the end of the institute, in terms of his/her potential for successfully mastering the law school curriculum.
- Provide law school placement assistance for all successful students.
- Provide $1,000 annual stipends to all students successfully completing the summer institutes and enrolled in an ABA accredited law school.
- Maintain records concerning law school enrollment, bar performance, and employment data of individuals served by the program.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In the 1982-83 academic year, 217 new students were supported in addition to 314 continuing students. In 1983-84, 229 new students will be supported along with 308 continuing students. Altogether over 3,300 students have participated in the CLEO program at 144 law schools. Table 1 summarizes awards for 1982 and 1983.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Students Served: During academic year 1982-83 over 200 potential first-year law students received six weeks of intensive pre-law training during the summer at seven law schools selected by CLEO to run these institutes. About 99 percent of these students completed the institutes and were admitted to law schools. They joined over 300 other CLEO students in their second or third year of legal study.

Types of Benefits Provided: The CLEO program has two central components of direct service to students in addition to its services to the law schools. The two primary student components are summer institutes for prospective law students and annual fellowships of $1,000 to those successful graduates of the summer institutes attending law schools. Participating law schools also waive tuition and fees for these students.

Program Effectiveness: In the past fourteen years, CLEO has assisted 3,270 students from disadvantaged backgrounds in gaining admission to law schools. As of February 1983, 1771 CLEO students have successfully completed law schools. A 1978 survey of CLEO fellows bar performance showed that 501 out of 678 fellows who responded out of the 1,410 who were sent questionnaires (or 73.9 percent), passed their bar examination on their first or second attempts. This compares with the national bar performance rate of 74 percent during the same period. (E.3)

Table 1

Summary of Awards for CLEO

	1982	1983
New Awards -		
Federal Dollars	$ 210,000	$229,000
Number of Students	210	229
Continuations -		
Federal Dollars	$ 340,000	$308,000
Number of Students	340	308
Summer Institutes -		
Federal Dollars	$ 210,000	$210,000
Number of Institutes	7	7
CLEO - Administrative Costs	$ 210,000	$253,000
Total	$ 960,000	$1,000,000
Total Students Supported	531	537

Source: E.1.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

An earlier study of the program indicated that while CLEO fellows' mean admission test scores were considerably lower than the national average (422 compared to 552), their academic standing reflects a surprisingly successful record of performance for the period of law school enrollment. Eighty-seven percent of those fellows surveyed were reported to be in good standing at the conclusion of the first year, 94.1 percent in the second year, and 99.6 percent in the third year. (E.3)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

During its first two years of operation, the program was funded solely from private sources. With Federal assistance, the program gained visibility and demonstrated its effectiveness in training disadvantaged individuals for successful careers in the legal profession. Now recognized as effective, this program is likely to attract support from businesses and other organizations which have a direct interest in training or employing CLEO fellows. Therefore, the Administration proposes to terminate this program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983

2. U.S. Department of Education "A Report on Specific Federally Funded Graduate Education Programs 1978 to 1980" (The Secretary's Report to Congress on Title IX of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended) January 1981.

3. Council of Legal Education Opportunity, Unpublished data on CLEO Fellows academic and bar performance data: 1978.

4. Applied Management Sciences, "A Study of the Specific Federally Funded Graduate Education Programs," February 1978.

F. Other Supporting Data

Table 2

Racial Composition of CLEO Participants in
Academic Year 1981-82 and 1982-83 2/ (E.3)

	Number		Percent Total	
	1981-82	1982-83	1981-82	1982-83
Black	301	326	54.7	61.4
Hispanic Americans	199	158	36.1	29.8
Asian Americans	19	18	2.5	3.4
American Indians	3	8	.5	1.5
Caucasians	13	15	2.4	2.8
Others	20	6	3.6	1.1
TOTAL	550	531 2/	99.3	100.0

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Louis Venuto (202) 245-2347

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Until FY 1982, "Such sums as may be necessary" were authorized for appropriation.
2. Of the total CLEO students in 1982-83, 283 or 53 percent were women.

FELLOWSHIPS FOR GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDY
(CFDA No. 84.094)

Highlights:

- o Because of the availability of non-Federal sources of financial support, no funds were requested for this program. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title IX, Part B; 20 U.S.C. 1134d-1134g.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	1/	1/
1980	1/	1/
1981	60,000,000 2/	$12,000,000
1982	14,000,000	10,560,000
1983	14,000,000	11,920,000

Purpose: To assist in making available the benefits of post-baccalaureate education to graduate and professional students who demonstrate financial need. Fellowships may be awarded to support students in the following categories: (1) Graduate and Professional Opportunity Fellowships, awarded to individuals from groups who are underrepresented in graduate or professional study; (2) Public Service Education Fellowships, awarded to individuals who plan to begin or continue a career in public service; and (3) Mining Fellowships, awarded to individuals who plan to study domestic mining and mineral fuel conservation.

Eligibility: Any institution of higher education with a graduate or professional program leading to an advanced or professional degree.

Applicant Requirements: Awards are made annually on a competitive basis to institutions of higher education who apply directly to the Department of Education. Instructions and forms concerning application procedures are mailed to all eligible institutions following publication of the notice of closing date in the Federal Register. Panels of experts from outside the Government evaluate all institutional applications and recommend funding to the Secretary, who makes the final decisions.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Allocations of fellowships are made to successful applicant institutions that, in turn, award the fellowships to qualified students. Grants to institutions are awarded for one year only. Renewals or extensions depend upon evidence of progress during the preceding year. In accordance with the statutory requirement, no grants may be made of less than $75,000 to any institution. The minimum award, however, does not apply where the grant is made to support continuation fellowships only. This requirement was waived completely in the FYs 1981, 1982, and 1983 appropriations language.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: All records must be retained for a period of 5 years from the termination of the award.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to each of these programs were:

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

- To provide access to graduate and professional education for 1015 qualified minorities and women, who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate level education;
- To meet national employment needs for well trained individuals, particularly minorities and women, in career fields of high national priority;
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 500 new students, maintain 700 continuation students, and graduate 500 minority and women students in high quality professional and academic programs.

Public Service Fellowships

- To provide access to graduate education in the public service areas for 230 qualified minorities and women who otherwise might be unable to obtain graduate level education;
- To increase the representation of minorities and women at the highest levels of public service, especially at the state and local levels; and
- To provide incentives to institutions of higher education to recruit 135 new students, maintain 95 continuation students, and graduate 100 minority and women students in high quality public service programs.

Mining Fellowships

- No funds were appropriated, so goals and objectives were not established.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

- o Grantees recruited minority students and women to fill the fellowships in the fields of study selected during the peer review process.
- o Over 50 percent of fellowships are awarded in the Physical Sciences, Engineering, and Life Sciences.

Public Service Fellowships

- o The program has strengthened the relationship between academic theory and actual practice by encouraging a provision for practical experiences and internships in public administration positions as an integral part of the curriculum for MPA programs.
- o It has strengthened academic and community ties, through its encouragement to colleges and universities to form cooperative arrangements with state and local governments.
- o The program has provided support to Historically Black Colleges and Universities by awarding over $154,000 in fellowships under the FY 1983 competition.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Students Served: Eligible college graduates apply for fellowships directly to institutions that have received grants. The student must meet all the institutional eligibility requirements for admission into one of the approved graduate or professional programs for which the institution awards fellowships. In FY 1983, fellowship stipends were awarded based on financial need up to a maximum of $4,500 per 12-month period. An institutional allowance of $3,900 per year is provided for each fellow enrolled in the program. Fellows must be full-time students and ordinarily cannot have the fellowships renewed beyond a 36-month time period. (E.1.)

Program Scope:

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

From fiscal year 1983 funds, 128 grants totaling almost $10,000,000 were made to colleges and universities to support 704 students in their second or third year of full-time graduate or professional study, and to support another 500 new students beginning their first year of study during 1983-84. It is projected that the fellows will study in academic and professional areas in roughly the same proportions as they have previously (See Program Effectiveness).

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

	1982-83 % of Total
Physical Science	18.1
Engineering	17.8
Life Science	16.3
Social Science	16.2
Psychology	6.3
Humanities	1.4
Professions:	
Law	15.8
Business	6.6
Education	1.5
	100.0

Public Service Fellowships

From fiscal year 1983 funds, 52 grants totaling almost $1,920,000 have been made to colleges and universities to support 106 students in their second year of full-time graduate study and to support another 149 new students beginning their first year of study during 1983-84 in the field of public administration or closely related areas. Fellows supported under the program are restricted to study in the field of Public Administration or closely related areas such as Urban Affairs, Public Policy Analysis, International Affairs, Environmental/Natural Resources Administration, etc.

Program Effectiveness:

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships

Final reports received during the fall of 1982 indicate that 55 students were awarded Ph.Ds., 174 students masters degrees, and 66 students received the first professional degree in law. These degrees were earned in the following areas:

	Ph.Ds.	Masters
Life Science	20	19
Physical Science	13	38
Engineering/Comp. Sc.	9	58
Social Science	5	18
Education	8	
Business Admin.		41
	55	174

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

Institutional projections indicate that another 83 students will be awarded the Ph.D. during the spring and summer of 1983. (E.1)

Public Service Fellowships

Based on Project Directors' annual performance reports, in 1982 an estimated 109 Public Service fellows received masters degrees in public administration or closely related fields. Institutional projections indicate that another 150 will be awarded a masters during 1983. (E.1) Detailed information on program participants by race and sex are provided under Section F below.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No funds are requested for the Graduate and Professional Opportunities Fellowships program. Currently, there are a wide variety of non-Federal sources of financial support available for minorities and women pursuing graduate study, especially in engineering and science. These include support from postsecondary institutions, foundations, and other private sources. Federal financial assistance is available to graduate students through the Work Study program and the National Direct Student Loan program. In addition, through the Guaranteed Student Loan program's Auxiliary Loan Assistance, graduate students will be eligible for loans of up to $8,000 annually.

Additionally there is no need for Federal encouragement of graduate study in the public service field. Many institutions currently offer high level, high quality graduate programs in public administration. Furthermore, there is now a substantial supply of qualified persons to fill public service jobs. The number of master's degrees awarded in public service fields increased by 141.5 percent between academic years 1970-71 and 1978-79, and doctoral degrees awarded in these fields increased by 106.7 percent during the same time period. Graduate students in public service fields are eligible to receive Federal financial assistance through the Work-Study program and the National Direct Student Loan program. Under the Guaranteed Student Loan program's Auxiliary Loan Assistance, graduate students will be eligible for loans of up to $8,000 per year to support their education.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C:

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

2. "Evaluability Assessment of the Graduate Professional Opportunities Program," the American Institutes for Research, Palo Alto, CA, July 1981

F. Other Supporting Data:

Program participation by sex and race follow for each program:

Graduate and Professional Opportunities Program

Based on five years of program experience, it is expected that the composition of 1983 fellows by sex and race will be similar to the fiscal year 1982 totals:

	% of Total	Number
Blacks	54.1	553
Hispanics	19.2	196
Asian Americans	5.4	55
Native Americans	3.0	31
Majority Women	18.3	187
	100.0	1022

Women overall, however, comprised more than 50 percent of the 1022 fellows supported at 115 institutions during academic year 1982-83.

Public Service Fellowships

The composition of the students participating in the program has changed from predominantly white male to predominantly women and minority males (79%). It is expected that the composition of these fellows by sex and race will show a gradual increase in the number of minority participants. The FY 1982 percentages are as follows:

ETHNICITY		% OF TOTAL
White		64%
Male	21%	
Female	43%	
Black		29%
Male	12%	
Female	17%	
Hispanic		5%
Male	3%	
Female	2%	
Asian-American		1%
Male	0	
Female	1%	
Native American		1%
Male	1%	
Female	0	
		100%

Overall, women comprised 63 percent of the fellows supported under the academic year 1982-83 program.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are being conducted or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Louis Venuto (202) 245-2347

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. The Education Amendments (P.L. 96-374) of 1980 provided for a new Part B of Title IX of HEA of 1965. The new Part B voids and replaces the old Part B (Graduate/Professional Education Opportunities Program), Part C (Public Service Fellowships), and Part D (Domestic Mining and Mineral and Mineral Fuel Conservation Fellowships) and constitutes a new Part B in which the separate authorities were combined into one authority. For information on each program prior to FY 1981 see the ED Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1981.

2. It should be noted that under the consolidated Part B, Section (e), it is required that at least as much money be spent each year on Public Service Fellowships, Mining Fellowships and G*POP fellowships as was spent in FY 1979 for each of these categories.

FULBRIGHT-HAYS TRAINING GRANTS PROGRAM
(CFDA Nos. 84.019, 84.020, 84.021, 84.022)

Highlights:

o No funds were requested for this program. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays Act), Section 102(b)(6); Public Law 87-256, 22 U.S.C. 2452 (b)(6) and Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, Sections 104(b)(2) and (3) Public Law 83-480; 7 U.S.C. 1691.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	1/	$3,000,000
1980		3,000,000
1981		6,200,000
1982		4,800,000
1983		5,000,000

Purpose: This program has four parts: Faculty Research Abroad, Foreign Curriculum Consultants, Group Projects Abroad, Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad.

(1) Faculty Research Abroad:

To help universities and colleges strengthen their programs of international studies through selected opportunities for research and study abroad in foreign language and area studies; to enable key faculty members to keep current in their specialties; to facilitate the updating of curriculum; and to help improve teaching methods and materials.

(2) Foreign Curriculum Consultants:

To benefit American education at all levels by helping institutions bring specialists from other countries to the United States to assist in planning and developing curricula in modern foreign language and area studies.

(3) Group Projects Abroad:

To help educational institutions improve their programs in modern foreign languages and areas.

(4) Doctoral Dissertation:

To provide opportunities for graduate students to engage in full-time dissertation research abroad in modern foreign language and area studies. This program is designed to develop research knowledge and capability about areas of the world not widely studied in American institutions.

Eligibility:

(1) Faculty Research Abroad:

Applicant Eligibility: Accredited American colleges or universities that offer instruction in foreign languages and area studies.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Candidates for faculty research awards must be U.S. citizens or nationals, with whom institutions have long-time employment relationships (visiting faculty members are ineligible) or educators experienced in foreign language and area studies. Candidates must have engaged in at least half-time teaching or research relevant to area of specialization during the two years preceding the date of the award; possess adequate skills in the language of the country or in a language germane to the project or region where the project would be undertaken.

(2) Foreign Curriculum Consultants:

American institutions eligible to apply for Foreign Curriculum Consultant grants are: State departments of education; local public school systems; institutions of higher education accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, private nonprofit educational organizations, or a consortium of these institutions.

(3) Group Projects Abroad:

Applicant Eligibility: Accredited universities; 4-year colleges; community and junior colleges; State departments of education; private nonprofit educational organizations; consortiums of institutions.

Beneficiary Eligibility: Individuals participating in Group Projects must be (1) U.S. citizens or nationals; and (2) faculty members in foreign language or area studies, experienced educators responsible for conducting, planning, or supervising programs in foreign language or area studies at the elementary, secondary, or junior college levels, or graduate students or upperclassmen who plan teaching careers in foreign language, area studies, or world affairs.

(4) Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad:

A candidate for a Dissertation Research Fellowship must be a citizen or national or permanent resident of the United States; plan to teach in a U.S. institution of higher education; be enrolled in an eligible U.S. institution and have been admitted to candidacy for a doctoral degree in foreign language or area studies; provide evidence of adequate foreign language skills to carry out effectively the proposed research. If applicant plans to conduct research in the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, or the German Democratic Republic, he or she must have applied to the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), 655 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017. If applicant plans to conduct research in the People's Republic of China, it is recommended that he or she also apply to the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People's Republic of China, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20418.

Applicant Requirements:

(1) Faculty Research Abroad:

Eligible institutions are responsible for accepting, screening, and forwarding to the Research Branch, Division of Advanced Training and Research International Education Programs, those individual applications which meet the institution's technical and academic criteria. Candidates for faculty research awards apply directly to their employing institutions.

Faculty members may address requests for general information to the Research Branch, Division of Advanced Training and Research, but obtain application forms from the appropriate office at their employing institutions. Applications are submitted directly to the institution, not to the Division.

The faculty member must present a detailed description of the proposed project; present a statement from the employing institution describing how the project will contribute to an institution's plans for developing programs in foreign language and area studies. If the applicant plans to work in the U.S.S.R., Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia or the German Democratic Republic, he or she must have applied to the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX), 655 Third Ave., New York, NY 10017. If the applicant plans to conduct research in the People's Republic of China, it is recommended that he or she also apply to the Committee on Scholarly Communications with the People's Republic of China, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C. 20418.

The Division of Advanced Training and Research makes the initial selection and recommendation of award recipients with the advice of a panel of specialists in foreign language, area studies, and world affairs, and comments by U.S. embassies and binational commissions in the proposed countries of research. The selections are subject to review and final approval by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

(2) Foreign Curriculum Consultants:

The Office of Postsecondary Education publicizes details and grant availabilities and receives proposals from American educational institutions. Assisted by a panel of experts from the academic community, the Office of Postsecondary Education makes preliminary recommendations to the Secretary. All recommended proposals are reviewed and approved by the presidentially appointed Board of Foreign Scholarships. Proposals approved at this stage are forwarded to appropriate U.S. diplomatic missions abroad to recruit candidates. The Board of Foreign Scholarships reviews and approves the resulting slate of candidates. Host institutions select the recipient.

(3) Group Projects Abroad:

An institution or organization interested in the program plans and proposes a group project that would significantly improve its program in foreign language and area studies. Specific guidelines for preparation of proposals as published in the Federal Register and subsequent submission are available upon request from International Education Programs. The institution or organization must give assurance that the individuals it nominates to undertake the projects are appropriately qualified.

With the advice of a panel of academic consultants and an assessment of the feasibility and suitability of each proposal by U.S. embassies and binational commissions in the proposed countries of study, the International Education Programs evaluates the proposals and makes initial selections and recommendations of grant recipients. The selections are subject to review and final approval by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

(4) Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad:

The graduate dean of a college or university or his representative is responsible for accepting, screening, and forwarding to the Research Branch, Division of Advanced Training and Research, International Education Programs, Office of Postsecondary Education those individual applications which meet the institution's technical and academic criteria. Candidates for dissertation research fellowships apply directly to the institutions at which they are enrolled in a Ph.D. program, not to the Department of Education.

Institutions request application materials from the Research Branch, Division of Advanced Training and Research. Students should address requests for application forms to the office of the graduate dean at the graduate schools at which they are enrolled in a Ph.D. program.

The candidate must present a feasible research project.

The Research Branch, Division of Advanced Training and Research, Office of Postsecondary Education makes initial selections and recommendations of award recipients with the advice of a panel of specialists in foreign language and area studies and comments by U.S. embassies and binational commissions in the proposed countries of research. Selections are subject to review and final approval by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance:

(1) Faculty Research Abroad:

Project grants are for three to twelve months.

(2) Foreign Curriculum Consultants

Length of assistance is eight to ten months. Payments are made to host institutions at the beginning of the fall term.

(3) Group Projects Abroad:

Assistance is determined by the duration of the project, ranging from six weeks to twelve months.

(4) Doctoral Dissertation Research Aborad:

Awards are made for at least six but not more than twelve months.

Obligations of Grant Recipients

Award recipients must file terminal reports. Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad grantees must also file interim reports. Fiscal records of institutions are subject to audit at any time within five years after close of the fiscal year in which expenditures are made or until the resolution of any outstanding audit questions.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

The goal and objectives for FY 1983 were to award project grants and fellowships within the prescribed schedule.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

(1) Following a national competition including domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, awards were made to institutions for individual Faculty Research Fellowships.

(2) Seventeen applications, representing 15 states and Puerto Rico, for the Foreign Curriculum Consultants program were received. All applications were reviewed by a panel of external academic experts, by ED staff, and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

(3) Seventy-two applications were received from 29 states for Group Projects Abroad. All applications were reviewed by a panel of experts, ED staff and by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

(4) Following a national competition for Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Fellowships, including domestic peer review and overseas host country approval, awards were made for individual research fellowships.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits:

The Faculty Research Abroad Program provides opportunities for faculty specializing in uncommonly taught modern foreign languages and area studies and teaching at institutions of higher education in the United States to conduct research overseas for the purpose of improving their skills and developing curricula.

The Foreign Curriculum Consultants Program enables eligible U.S. institutions to bring specialists from other countries to the United States for an academic year to assist in planning and developing curricula in modern foreign languages and area studies.

The Group Projects Abroad Program provides grants to U.S. educational institutions and organizations for training, research, advanced foreign language training, curriculum development, and preparation or acquisition of instructional materials in international and intercultural studies by groups of individuals engaged in a common endeavor. Special Bi-lateral Projects provide U.S. educators with short-term training seminars abroad on foreign languages and world area studies with a view toward sharing this experience with students, colleagues and others after returning to the United States; to support bi-lateral education projects between the U.S. and countries abroad between USED and selected foreign Ministries of Education.

The Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad Program provides opportunities for graduate students who plan to teach at institutions of higher education in the United States to conduct research overseas on approved Ph.D. dissertation topics in non-Western language and area studies.

Program Effectiveness:

No recent studies completed.

Program Scope: The following awards were made in FY 1983:

- Faculty Research Abroad: 35 fellowships were awarded at 31 institutions for a total amount of $747,608.
- Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad: 113 fellowships were awarded to 30 institutions for a total amount of $1,899,371.
- Group Projects Abroad: Thirty-two projects totaling $2,147,213 were supported in fiscal year 1983. Twenty-five proposals utilized U.S. dollars in the amount of $1,718,103. Seven projects were supported under the U.S.-owned foreign currency category totaling $429,110.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

- Foreign Curriculum Consultants: Seven projects totaling $94,830 were supported.

- Special Bi-lateral Projects: Eight projects were supported for a total of $660,000 in Italy, Israel, Korea, China, Brazil, Liberia, India and Pakistan.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

- No funds were requested for this program. This action reflected the Administration's effort to curtail Federal expenditures and encourage individuals, institutions, businesses, and other organizations to provide a greater share of support for international education and foreign language studies.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Section C Above:

- Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

See Program Effectiveness (II.C) in Language Training and Area Studies.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are being conducted or planned.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead (202) 245-9691

Program studies: Robert H. Berls (202) 245-7884

Notes

1. Indefinite, does not have specific money authorization.

LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES
(CFDA Nos. 84.015, 84.016, 84.017)

Highlights

- No funds were requested for this program since these activities are now well-established in the funded institutions. (II-D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, Title VI, 20 U.S.C. 1121.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$75,000,000	$17,000,000
1980	75,000,000	17,000,000
1981	57,750,000	19,800,000
1982	30,600,000	19,200,000
1983	30,600,000	21,000,000

Purpose:

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Languages Programs: To (1) assist institutions of higher education to plan, develop, and carry out a comprehensive program to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign language, and (2) assist associations and organizations to develop projects that will make an especially significant contribution to strengthening and improving undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages.

National Resource Centers: To promote instruction in those modern foreign languages and area and international studies critical to national needs by supporting the establishment, strengthening and operation of such programs at colleges and universities.

Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships: To meet the needs of the United States for experts in modern foreign languages, area studies, and world affairs by supporting fellowships for advanced study at institutions for higher education.

International and Studies Research: To improve foreign language and area studies training through support of research and studies, experimentation, and development of specialized instructional materials.

Eligibility:

Programs: Accredited colleges and universities, and public and non-profit private agencies and organizations.

Centers: Accredited American colleges and universities.

Fellowships: Accredited institutions of higher education offering comprehensive graduate language and area and international studies are eligible to apply for award quotas.

Research: Institutions of higher education; qualified individual researchers; State educational agencies; public school systems; other educational and professional organizations.

Applicant Requirements:

Programs: When funds are available for the support of new programs, announcements are issued in the Federal Register. Application forms and guidelines for submission of proposals are available from the International Studies and Foreign Language Program, International Programs, Office of Postsecondary Education.

Institutions must provide evidence of existing resources and institutional commitment to language and area and international studies through a curriculum that provides instruction dealing with a particular world area and its languages, with comparative world area studies, or with the international aspects of professional or other fields of study.

Centers and Fellowships: Eligible institutions submit proposals for the funding of centers only, fellowships only, or both when the announcement of a new competition is issued in the Federal Register. Application forms and guidelines for the submission of proposals are available from the Centers and Fellowships Branch. This program is subject to the provisions of OMB Circular No. A-110. Higher education institutions currently receiving funds for a two or three year phased program support may submit annual proposals for the continuation of such support. New students seeking fellowships may apply to the institutions annually.

Research: Formal applications are prepared in response to announcements of program requirements and closing dates in the Federal Register.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance:

Programs and Centers: Grants are awarded for 12 month periods, subject to renewals of 1 or 2 years. Payments are made as stipulated in the grant.

Fellowships: Academic year payments are made by the institution during the term of the fellowship. If summer fellowships are issued, they will be for a summer session in which the equivalent of an academic year's foreign language study is completed.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance (Continued)

Research: A project is generally no longer than 18 months. The duration of the project is determined during the negotiation process. When additional time is required to complete a project, conducted under a contract, continuation of support may be negotiated, subject to examination of accomplished work and availability of funds. Projects conducted under a grant may be phased, with the phases following the first phase subject to renewal on a noncompetitive basis. Renewals of grants, which were not included in the original negotiations, will be considered in competition with all other new applications.

Obligations of Grant Recipients:

Program and Centers: All programs must provide final reports upon completion of the grant. Financial reports are also required. All records supporting claims under grant or relating to the accountability for awarded funds must be available upon request for five years.

Fellowships: All records bearing on the receipt and expenditure of funds under the program must be available for inspection by the Department (1) for 3 years after the fiscal year in which grant funds are spent, (2) until audit or for five years after the grant, or (3) until resolution of any audit questions.

Research: A final report or subject data as established through negotiation is required along with interim progress reports and financial reports. All fiscal records will be subject to audit by the Department at any time within 3 years after expiration of the contract or grant.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

To continue the programs' purposes:

National Resource Centers: The National Resource Centers Program provides general assistance for nationally recognized centers of excellence in modern foreign languages and international studies in order to maintain and extend U.S. capability to train and sustain specialists and foster research in modern foreign languages and international studies.

FLAS Fellowships: The Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships Program provides incentive awards to meritorious students undergoing advanced training in modern foreign languages and related area studies. The fellowships are awarded through approved institutions with nationally recognized programs of excellence.

A. Goals and Objectives: (Continued)

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program: Priority is given to the following types of projects:

- Projects that are initiated by front line service delivery institutions, such as institutions of higher education. Applications from organizations and associations are funded only for projects which make an especially significant contribution to strengthening and improving undergraduate instruction in international studies and foreign languages;

- Projects that are locally developed, have strong institutional and community support, and use Federal dollars in partnership with institutional and private sector funding;

- Projects that strengthen the acquisition of basic and higher level skills in modern foreign languages, and in disciplines such as the history, anthropology, economics, and the geography of the areas where such foreign languages are spoken;

- Projects that strengthen the acquisition of knowledge and skills in professional fields with an international component, such as agriculture, business, education, law, and journalism, or that develop skills for the analysis of critical issues such as economic development, technology utilization, national security, or international trade;

- Projects that utilize computers to implement more effective means of teaching modern foreign languages, and for the collection and analysis of information about critical international issues;

- "Seed" projects that include specific plans and supporting evidence that shows the projects would continue without Federal assistance when the grant terminates.

Business and International Education: Objectives are to:

- Promote innovation and improvement in international education curricula to serve the needs of the business community;

- Increase international skills of the business community; and

- Develop linkages between institutions of higher education and the business community involved in international economic activities.

International Research and Studies Program: The goal of this program is to support research designed to improve and strengthen the status of foreign languages, area studies, and other related instruction in the American educational system. To help accomplish this objective, priority is given to applications proposing to conduct research in the following areas:

- The use of computers in improving foreign language instruction;
- Foreign language acquisition;
- Improving teaching methodologies for foreign language instruction;
- Foreign language proficiency testing; and
- Instructional materials development for uncommonly taught languages.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

National Resource Centers: Ninety-one centers were funded, 78 of them comprehensive graduate and undergraduate and 13 of them undergraduate. The average unit cost for comprehensive centers was $122,000 and for undergraduate centers $78,000. The total centers budget of $10,600,000 was awarded. (Table 1)

FLAS Fellowships: The national competition for fellowships yielded 117 institutional awards representing the equivalent of about 700 academic year fellowships (some of the funds were used for summer awards for advanced intensive language training.) Because the Federal grant was not always exactly divisible by an institution's average unit cost (there are varying tuition rates on most campuses) there were many cases where non-Federal funds were added to round out the next whole fellowship. Thus, the total number of fellowship generated amounted to approximately 750 or about 50 more than Federal funds support. The total fellowship budget was $6,000,000.

Combined Grants: Because some grants combined centers and fellowship awards and some grants represented only centers or only fellowships, a total of 123 grants was issued. These grants were made to 47 institutions, 27 of them public and 20 private.

Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Programs: Of the 54 projects funded in FY 1983, six were of particular interest because they focused on a new area -- international business and the acquisition of foreign language skills for technical and professional use.

Business and International Education Program: This program was funded for the first time in FY 1983 with 22 grants awarded for an average grant of $45,000. The grantees comprised eleven universities, six four-year colleges and seven two-year colleges. All the grantees have linkage agreements with the business community involved in export related trade or international economic activities.

International Research and Studies Program: This program made 20 awards averaging $46,000 in FY 1983 and concentrated its grants on projects conducting research on the improvement of foreign language instruction.

B. Progress and Accomplishments (Continued)

Table 1
A Summary of Funding
For Fiscal Years 1982 and 1983
By Program Areas

Program Scope:

	1982	1983
NATIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS		
No. of centers	90	91
Avg. cost per center	$113,045	$116,480
Total centers	$10,174,000	$10,600,000
FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES FELLOWSHIPS		
No. of institutions	113	117
No. of fellowships	800	700
Average cost (academic year)	$7,406	$8,570
Total Fellowships	$5,925,000	$6,000,000
RESEARCH PROGRAM		
No. of awards	29	20
Average cost	$40,103	$46,000
Total Research Program	$1,163,000	$920,000
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROGRAMS		
No. of awards	60	54
Range of awards	$40,000-80,000	$30,000-80,000
Total International Studies and Foreign Language Programs	$1,938,000	$2,300,000
INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS PROGRAM		
No. of awards	--	22
Average cost	--	$45,000
Total International Business	--	$1,000,000
TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS	$19,200,000	$21,000,000

Source: E.1.

B. Program and Accomplishments (Continued)

The International Business Program made awards, in its first year of operation, to 11 universities, six four-year colleges, and seven two-year colleges. All grantees have arranged linkage agreements with the business community involved in export related trade or international economic activity.

Within the undergraduate studies program, six new projects focus on international business and the acquisition of foreign language skills for technical and professional use. Four new projects concentrate on computer - assisted instruction in foreign languages, or on the implemention of inter-active TV instructional systems for the teaching of international studies and foreign languages.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Effectiveness: The Rand Corporation has recently completed a two-phased evaluation of the Foreign Language and Area Studies Program. The phase one report analyzed program management and identified selected activities that maximize program efficiency. The major conclusions of this report are (E.2.):

Centers: The centers have traditionally received the bulk of Title VI funds. Most centers, however, have not adapted their training to financial and market conditions, but continue to prepare students for research and teaching, and frequently emphasize the humanities in their programs. Although graduates in the humanities suffer relatively high levels of unemployment, centers have not linked their programs to more policy-oriented programs or helped students to identify and prepare for non-academic jobs. The result is a gap between center focus and national need, as defined by academic, government, and business employers.

The centers program should make the following changes:

- adopt a more flexible definition of potential grant recipients;
- improve the link between area studies centers and professional schools;
- adopt a broader definition of "outreach" requirements for centers;
- require that on-site reviews be more thorough;
- clarify the criteria for review by awards panels;
- make a greater effort to recruit important scholars from institutions that do not apply for the program to be members of review panels.

Programs: The Foreign Language and Area Studies program has not effectively influenced either the supply or the distribution of specialists. The lack of proper incentives has made the Department unsuccessful in encouraging language and area studies among students in the professions, and especially those in high-demand disciplines such as economics. Moreover, the rigidity of professional curricula makes it difficult for students to include language and area studies. The Department should take the following actions:

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

- determine trends in employment of former fellowship holders and assess the match between training and employment;
- establish a protected competition for advanced students of the professions and in high-demand disciplines;
- establish sabbatical awards for mid-career graduates to maintain and improve skills.

Undergraduate Curricula: The Department currently funds two-year "start-up" projects to promote the development of international studies in undergraduate curricula. Forty-two percent of these projects were continued by the sponsoring institution after Federal funding ended. This is a much higher rate of continuation than for other Federal programs with a similar "start-up" strategy. Projects identified as successful in this program become part of the National Diffusion Network or other funds should be set aside for dissemination.

Research: Although the original intent of this program was to provide support for the other three program components, it has not done so. The research program has been a major source of new teaching materials for languages that are not usually taught. It is not widely publicized because its funds do not support the publication and dissemination of products developed with those funds. The Department should take the following actions:

- fund a dissemination study to determine the demand for research program products and the best ways of serving potential users;
- make "add-on" grants to prepare successful pre-tested materials for publication;
- increase support for materials for area studies and decrease the number of language surveys;
- coordinate the research program with the other Title VI program components.

The program staff began to initiate corrective action on several of these recommendations in the 1982 competition for centers and fellowships.

The just completed second phase of this study analyzed supply and demand trends for foreign language and area studies graduates, and assessed the relationships between employment and program-supported training (E.3.).

The principal findings of phase two are:

- On balance, the FLAS program has played an important role in a training process that has attracted a broad base of competent and highly motivated students. These students spent considerable time in language and area studies training and now rate the education they received very highly. To the extent that comparisons are possible, FLAS recipients are receiving more training than older specialists did, and are more competent; but they are seriously concerned about the lack of opportunity for language study abroad, and the seeming unresponsiveness of the

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness: (continued)

graduate training process to a changing job market for their skills. In fact, throughout this profile of former FLAS recipients, one finding has emerged repeatedly: the training of language and area studies specialists has remained relatively static, while major changes have occurred in employment and skill utilization patterns.

- The portrait that emerges of the typical FLAS recipient is that of a serious student who entered graduate school with some prior exposure to international studies and who, while in graduate school, spent considerable time in language training and related disciplinary study. On average, FLAS recipients obtained more language training than the average undergraduate and the vast majority had some firsthand experience in another country or region of the world. However, only about half had either coursework or first-hand experience in the region in which they later specialized; most of them entered graduate school armed with the skills required for foreign language study and motivated to immerse themselves in the study of another culture.

- The FLAS fellowship program has functioned well as a meritocratic system that has brought good students from a very wide variety of undergraduate institutions to the best universities in the country for language and area studies training. Most FLAS recipients between 1962 and 1979 majored in history or the humanities, with a smaller number in the social sciences and even fewer in professional disciplines. The humanities orientation of the FLAS program is most evident among Soviet specialists, half of whom majored in language and literature.

- FLAS Ph.D.s with academic jobs are currently teaching in over 450 colleges and universities, and most of them work in institutions that are non-selective in their undergraduate admissions policies. In this very important way, then, the specialist expertise produced with FLAS assistance is now being disseminated broadly to undergraduates in all types of institutions. In addition, the majority of academics, regardless of the type of institution in which they teach, report using their language and area studies expertise all or most of the time.

- The vast majority (over 75 percent) of FLAS Ph.D.s are currently teaching in colleges and universities, but the proportion has steadily decreased over cohorts. More than twice as many Ph.D.s in the 1977-79 cohort hold nonacademic jobs as do those who earned their doctorates in the 1967-70 cohort (28.6 percent versus 13.7 percent). Most of those (60 percent) in non-academic jobs sought academic employment. The average over the cohorts for non-academic employment is 25 percent with the latest cohort reaching about 30 percent.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

- This growing shift from academic to non-academic employment has profound implications for the extent to which language and area specialists are able to use their skills. The one-fourth-of FLAS Ph.D's who are not employed in postsecondary education work for a variety of employers, particularly profit-making organizations. (Only nine percent of those with non-academic jobs chose them.) Those in non-academic jobs typically do not use their skills -- especially those in profit-making employment. But those who are employed by the federal government typically don't use their skills either: only 1 of 3 on the average use their skills, with a high of 1 of 2 for those in the Russian/Slavic area to a low of 1 of 6 who are African specialists.

- For the FLAS fellowship for those recipients who attained the Ph.D., unemployment (or holding only a part-time job) has doubled from the 1967-70 cohort to the 1977-79 cohort. That is, the most recent cohort is twice as likely to be unemployed as the earliest cohort in the study.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No funds were requested for this program. Most of the institutions receiving assistance under this program have done so for many years, and these activities are now well-established parts of their curricula. The Administration believes funding responsibility should be assumed by these institutions.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

2. Federal Support for International Studies: The Role of NDEA Title VI. (final report for phase one of a two-part study for the U.S. Department of Education), Lorraine M. McDonnell and others. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1981.

3. Federal Support for Training for Language and Area Specialists: The Education and Careers of FLAS Fellowship Recipients. (final report for phase two of a two-part study for the U.S. Department of Education), Lorraine M. McDonnell and others. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data:

Table 2

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FLAS PH.D'S (N = 1949)

	%
Sex	
Male	78.1
Female	21.9
Racial/Ethnic Group	
White/Caucasian	93.1
Minority Group	5.7
Black	0.9
Hispanic	2.2
Asian	2.3
Amer. Indian	0.3
No Report	1.3
Age in 1982	
Under 35	7.9
35-39	29.3
40-44	36.8
45-49	15.0
50-54	6.8
55 or over	3.3
No report	0.8
Median Age (Years)	40.9
Ph.D Year	
1967	4.6
1968	5.5
1969	6.3
1970	8.4
1971	8.0
1972	9.4
1973	10.0
1974	8.5
1975	9.1
1976	8.7
1977	7.1
1978	7.7
1979	6.6

Source: Study E.3 cited above.

Table 3

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF NON-PH.D. FLAS RECIPIENTS (N = 537)

	%
Sex	
Male	59.9
Female	40.1
Racial/Ethnic Group	
White/Caucasian	92.1
Minority Group	5.3
Black	1.7
Hispanic	0.3
Asian	3.3
No Report	2.7
Age in 1982	
Under 35	36.1
35-39	30.5
40-44	20.9
45-49	7.3
50-54	1.9
55 or over	1.3
No report	1.3
Median Age (Years)	36.2
MA Cohort	
Pre 1970	30.9
1970-1974	28.3
1975-1982	30.5
No MA	10.4

Source: Study E.3 cited above.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Kenneth D. Whitehead, (202) 245-9691

Program studies: Robert H. Berls, (202) 245-7884

COOPERATIVE EDUCATION
(CFDA No. 84.055)

Highlights:

o Because the benefits of a Cooperative Education Program have been demonstrated and such programs are now widely available, the program's objectives have been achieved. No funds were requested for FY 1984. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title VIII, Public Law 89-329; 20 U.S.C. 1133 - 1133b.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 28,000,000	$15,000,000
1980	28,000,000	15,000,000
1981	35,000,000	23,000,000
1982	20,000,000	14,400,000
1983	20,000,000	14,400,000

Purpose: To provide Federal support for the planning, establishment, expansion, training of personnel in, or carrying out of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education, for projects demonstrating or exploring the feasibility or value of innovative methods of comprehensive institutional cooperative education, or for research into methods of improving, developing, or promoting the use of cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education. (Cooperative education programs are those with alternating or parallel periods of academic study and public or private employment related to the student's academic program or professional goals.)

Eligibility: Accredited institutions of higher education. Other public or private nonprofit agencies and organizations are also eligible for training and research grants.

Applicant Requirements: Applicants must submit signed statements that they have complied with Federal civil rights legislation including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and, where appropriate, that they meet the definition of higher education given in Section 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The maximum grant an institution of higher education may receive in a single fiscal year for the administration of programs is $325,000. A consortium may receive $250,000 times the number of institutions in the consortium. No such limitation applies to demonstration projects, training or research programs. Eligibility for administration grants is limited to five years for a unit of an institution of higher education, individually or as a participant in a combination of institutions of higher education.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance (Continued)

Under section 802 multi year grants are available to support projects for a total of 60 months if no previous Federal Cooperative Education Program funds were received by the applicant. Institutions which have received single-year section 802 grants in previous years are only eligible to apply for single-year grants. Projects supported under section 803 may receive multi-year grants for a total of 36 months.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Annual fiscal and progress reports must be submitted at the termination of the grant period and other information must be furnished as requested. Participants are subject to Federal audits.

Institutions receiving second, third, fourth and fifth year administrative grants are required to provide joint funding amounting to 10, 20, 40 and 70 percent of such costs respectively. They must also spend on cooperative education an amount not less than they spent the previous year.

Institutions of higher education must also assign students to jobs relevant to their academic program and provide supervision during the work period. Institutions evaluate, with the employer, the student's job performance. In most cases, students are regularly enrolled and awarded academic credit for the work experience.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983 the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Stimulate institutions to initiate school-wide cooperative education for all students.
- Stimulate the growth of inter-department cooperative education programs, especially for newly participating institutions.
- Provide training grants to assist faculty members and administrators to design and implement cooperative education programs and to emphasize the improvement of training techniques.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

In Fiscal Year 1983 the following activities were funded.

- 15 non-comprehensive demonstration grants were funded to bring the total to date to 36.
- Of the 152 newly participating institutions 20 received three to five multi-year awards to assure funding over the development period.
- To assure access across the nation the 11 two and four year training grants were awarded with a wide geographical distribution.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Types of Benefits:

Four categories of grants are provided under this program.

1. Administration grants - projects generally focus on a single department or cluster of departments in an institution of higher education. Funds are used to develop and carry out cooperative education programs and to strengthen and expand linkages with employers (and local high school cooperative education programs).

2. Comprehensive demonstration grants - large grants assist institutions plan and initiate institution-wide cooperative educational approaches to postsecondary programs of study.

3. Research grants - projects collect, study and disseminate information on cooperative education programs and practices.

4. Training grants - projects provide institution program directors and faculty and professionals in business with information on how to administer and expand their cooperative education programs.

Program Scope: In fiscal year 1983, 437 applications were submitted by eligible applicants requesting a total of $62,239,481. The appropriation for fiscal year 1983 is $14.4 million.

From the $14.4 million appropriation, grants were awarded to 196 of the 437 applicants. Of these 196 awards, 170 were administration grants, totaling $9,400,000; 15 were comprehensive demonstration grants, totaling $4,100,000; and 11 were training grants, totaling $900,000. Grants totaling $4,915,600, were awarded to 74 two-year public and private institutions of higher education; grants, totaling $9,244,400 were awarded to 119 four-year public/private institutions; and grants, totaling $240,000, were awarded to 3 non-profit organizations.

It is estimated that 175,000 students enrolled in the program. Distributions to institutions are provided in more detail in Table 1. Of particular interest are average awards by institutional type and control. Also of interest are the distribution to colleges serving large numbers of Black Hispanic Students.

Program Effectiveness: In 1970, less than 200 institutions were participating in Cooperative Education. By 1980, well over 1000 schools had such a program. Most of the increase was due to the availability of Federal funds, since half of all applicants received awards. However, despite the fact that one-third of all postsecondary institutions have participated in the program, only about two percent of all students in the nation have participated in the program.

Earlier studies of student participants (fully described in E.3) indicate that upon graduation, participating students had a more specific sense of career objectives. They were also more likely to be employed in an occupation related to their field of study and had higher expected lifetime earnings.

Table 1

Distribution of Cooperative Education Grants
By Institutional Type and Control
FY 1982 and FY 1983

	FY1982	FY 1983
Applications received:	437	437
# Grants awarded by institutional type:		
2 year public	75	70
2 year private	3	4
4 year public	45	48
4 year private	73	71
public/private organizations secondary/vocational schools	1	3
HBCUs	12	7
predominately Hispanic	4	2
predominately Black (not HBCU)	6	4
predominately Asian	0	0
Federal funds to:		
2 year public	$4,370,872	$4,719,400
2 year private	123,392	196,200
4 year public	2,919,734	3,125,100
4 year private	6,811,002	6,119,300
public/private organizations others	$175,000	240,000
HBCUs	$1,542,458	$614,000
predominately Hispanic	147,392	89,100
predominately Black (not HBCU)	753,269	536,300
predominately Asian	0	0
Average award to		
2 year public	$58,278	$67,420
2 year private	41,131	48,050
4 year public	64,883	65,106
4 year private	93,301	86,187
HBCUs	$128,538	$87,729
predominately Hispanic	36,848	44,550
predominately Black (not HBCU)	125,545	134,075
predominately Asian	0	0
Total # of participants (students) being served: in all co-op programs	170,000 Est.	175,000 Est.

Source: E.1.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No funds were requested for this activity in 1984. With more than one-third of the Nation's postsecondary institutions having cooperative education programs, and with more widespread recognition of the benefits of this educational approach, there is no longer a pressing need for Federal encouragement and stimulation in this area. The concept has been demonstrated adequately, as evidenced by the number of participating institutions.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. Program Files - Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
2. Office of Management and Budget, Justification of Appropriation Estimates for Committees on Appropriations, Fiscal Year 1982, Education, Volume 1.
3. Annual Evaluation Report for FY 1981, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
4. Applied Management Sciences, "Cooperative Education - A National Assessment." Silver Spring, Maryland, 1977.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Morris L. Brown, (202) 245-2146

Program Studies: Sal Corrallo, (202) 245-7884

LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
(CFDA No. 84.135)

Highlights:

- o Program was transferred to the Agriculture Department after the Department of Education completed the FY 83 funding. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Second Morrill Act of 1890; 7 U.S.C. 322 et seq. and Department of Agriculture Appropriations Act of 1907 (Nelson Amendment); 7 U.S.C. 312 et seq.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$2,700,000	$2,700,000
1980	2,700,000	2,700,000
1981	2,800,000[1]	2,800,000
1982	2,800,000	2,800,000
1983	2,800,000	2,800,000

Purpose: To provide Federal support to States and jurisdictions regarded as States for the purpose of this legislation, for collegiate-level instruction in agriculture and the mechanical arts. In addition, program funds may be used to support instruction in the English language and the various branches of mathematical, physical, natural, and economic sciences.

The objective of the First Morrill Act of 1862 was to provide public lands to any State that would agree to establish an institution in which programs in agriculture and the mechanical arts would be available to the sons and daughters of working class people. The objective of the Second Morrill Act of 1890 was to provide those States having a dual school system annual funds for support of land-grant colleges and to authorize funds for the establishment of a land-grant college for Black persons. Later amendments to the aid to land-grant colleges program were designed to maintain and increase the level of Federal support in continuing the availability of these educational programs for persons whose educational opportunities were limited.

Eligibility: States in which land-grant colleges or universities are located are eligible for funds. A land-grant college or university is an institution designated by a State legislature for the benefits of the First Morrill Act of 1862 or the Second Morrill Act of 1890.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: $50,000 annual grant to each State, or other jurisdictions with no matching requirement. There are currently 74 land-grant institutions within 56 states and other jurisdictions. Monies are paid directly to State treasuries and, in the event that more than one land-grant institution exists in a State, State legislature must provide by statute for the division of these monies. [2]

Restrictions: Funds may not be used to purchase land, nor may they be applied to the purchase, erection, repair, or preservation of buildings. Each land-grant institution is required to provide annually to the Department of Education a report on the expenditure of monies received under all land-grant appropriations.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

- To process grants quickly so that the program could be transferred.
- To transfer program to the Department of Agriculture.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Grants were awarded within the time schedule.
- Once program funds were distributed, the program was officially transferred to the Department of Agriculture.3/

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In FY 1983, $2,800,000 was apportioned among the 56 states and other jurisdictions. Of the 74 land-grant institutions, only Cornell University in Ithaca, New York, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology retain elements of private control. All of the land-grant colleges offer educational programs of more than two years duration. Land-grant institutions now exist in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa and Micronesia. (E.1)

Level of Benefits: The aid to land-grant colleges and universities program assists 74 land-grant institutions in meeting costs of instruction and equipment. The $50,000 annual grants are allotted by formula between the one or two institutions in each state. The Black colleges receive much less than one half of the $50,000. The average in FY 1980 was $12,937. On the other hand, Cornell and Massachusetts Institute of Technology receive a full $50,000. (E.1)

Program Effectiveness: The Morill-Nelson permanent appropriation is a miniscule source of funds for the 74 land-grant colleges and universities, which include some of the strongest and most prestigious institutions of learning in the country, such as Cornell University, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and many of the major State universities.

Program Effectiveness: (continued)

Since these grants form a very small part of the institutions' recent budgets and the use of land-grant monies is of a discretionary nature, the current impact of these funds is difficult to assess. Nonetheless, a review of the list of recipient institutions suggests that the land-grant institutions in this program have provided the bulk of the technical expertise which has made the U.S. agricultural sector the most technologically advanced and dynamic in the world.

It is noteworthy to report that the 16 predominantly Black land-grant institutions in the South are also eligible for aid under the HEA Title III, Institutional Development Program.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

The program is no longer administered by the Department of Education. Administrative authority was transfered to the Department of Agriculture beginning with the 1983-84 academic year.[3]

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis as Cited in Section C:

1. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

F. Other Supporting Data

Table 1
Selected Characteristics of Institutions Funded, 1980 [4]

	Institution		Funding	
	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
Historically Black	16	22	$ 207,000	7
Predominately Black	2	3	100,000	4
Hispanic	2	3	100,000	4
Samoa and Micronesia	2	3	100,000	4
All	74	100	2,300,000	100

Eighteen land-grant institutions are historically or predominantly Black. They represent 25 percent of the institutions but only 11 percent of the funding. Sixteen States had to split their $50,000 grant between their historically Black institution and their other land-grant institution (E.1).

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No additional studies are planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Jane Coulter, (202) 447-7854

Program Studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

Notes:

1. The Education Amendments of 1980 established the Community College of American Samoa and the College of Micronesia as land grant colleges, bringing the number of jurisdictions to 56.

2. In 1978, administration of the Bankhead-Jones Act was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Education, through 1983, administered only the Second Morrill Act, with its $50,000 annual grant to each of 56 states and other jurisdictions.

   The original Act provided public land (in the amount of 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative of a State). The Second Morrill Act provided for an appropriation of $25,000 for each State having a land-grant institution. The Nelson Amendment of 1907 doubled these appropriations to $50,000. Puerto Rico was added in 1908; the District of Columbia in 1969; Guam and the Virgin Islands in 1973; and American Samoa and Micronesia in 1980. The Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935 is another program for land grant colleges and is funded through the Agriculture Department.

3. The program was transferred in the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-98, Section 1419). The transfer was intended to be effective immediately upon passage of this act in 1981, but no action was taken until 1983.

4. Totals do not add to 100% since some are included under more than one category.

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM
(CFDA No. 84.142)

Highlights:

- o $40 million in new loan commitments were made in FY 1982 and FY 1983 (II.C).
- o No authority for new loan commitments was requested since enrollment is no longer increasing. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Housing Act of 1950, as amended, Title IV; 12 U.S.C 1749 et seq. (Pursuant to Sec. 306 of Public Law 96-88, Department of Education Organization Act, the College Housing Program was transferred by determination order of OMB from HUD to ED on May 4, 1980.)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation	
		Annual	Permanent
1979	Indefinite	$13,097,000	$241,000
1980	"	13,645,000	212,000
1981	"	0	279,000
1982	"	0	232,000
1983	"	0	40,000

Purpose: To alleviate severe student and faculty housing shortages through construction, acquisition, or rehabilitation; to provide student and faculty housing and related facilities; and to reduce fuel consumption or other operating costs of existing eligible housing and related facilities. Currently, loans are limited to energy conservation, rehabilitation and relieving severe localized housing shortages.

Method of Operation: The College Housing Program enables the Secretary of Education to make direct Federal loans to higher education institutions and certain other eligible college housing agencies at a three percent interest rate. The funds are provided from U.S. Treasury borrowings and through proceeds from the sale of participation certificates, backed by pools of existing college housing loans, and marketed through the Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA), as trustor. The difference in interest owed on participation certificates (approximately 6 percent) and the interest earned on institutional loans (about 3 percent) has been met previously by Congressional appropriation. For FY 1984, the difference was proposed to be paid from the unobligated balance which comes largely from institutional loan repayments. The Department must pay to GNMA $451.5 million by 1987-88. Loan repayments need to be used largely for this purpose, but Congress has traditionally mandated that the Department spend some funds on new loan commitments each year.

Eligibility: Public or private nonprofit colleges and universities offering at least a 2-year program acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor's degree, and public or private nonprofit hospitals operating nursing schools or internship and resident programs, public higher educational facility authorities, nonprofit student housing cooperatives, and nonprofit corporations established solely to provide student or faculty housing are eligible.

Applicant Requirements: The applicant must be authorized by a governing body to borrow and provide financial statements for current as well as past years. The institution must provide documentation as to estimated project costs, need for the project, and estimated cost savings if the project intends to reduce fuel consumption. Each institution must develop its own plans, subject to local zoning and building codes. Competition for construction contracts is required.

Evaluation of Applications: Before the loan is approved, the soundness of the plan is determined by Government inspection and the ability of the institution to pay back the loan must be assured.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Loans may be scheduled for repayment over periods of up to 30 years (up to 50 years in some circumstances) at 3 percent interest. There are no matching requirements.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Certification of final project costs are required prior to close-out. Periodic reports on the status of pledged revenues are required. Audits may be made at the discretion of the Department of Education. In addition, copies of the institution's audited financial statements must be submitted.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to the College Housing Program were as follows:

- To provide low interest loans to institutions of postsecondary education for the purchase, construction, or rehabilitation of housing and related educational facilities in order to relieve severe housing shortages in the higher education community.
- To administer the annual loan competition in an accurate and sound manner and ensure that awards are made on schedule.
- To continue efforts in the area of credit management improvement to ensure that sound loans are made and the Federal interest is protected.
- To support the objectives of the President's Executive Order 12320 to assist Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).
- To enhance the verification and validation controls of the program to ensure that awards are made to institutions with valid and severe housing deficiencies.
- To reduce regulatory burden on institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- o Awarded $40 million in new loan commitments supporting 14 housing construction projects and 5 energy conservation projects in FY 1982.
- o Awarded nearly 20% of available funds to HBCUs in FY 1982, and anticipate exceeding the regulatory 10% minimum set-aside provision to HBCUs again in FY 1983. Participated in National Technical Assistance Workshop for HBCUs in May 1982.
- o Acquired computer support for the ranking of housing applications.
- o Acquired the services of ROFEC (engineering consultants) to review and monitor projects to ensure project feasibility and compliance with Federal regulations.
- o Streamlined regulations and application material to decrease burden on institutions, and yet increase control for verification and validation of data regarding applicants' financial status and housing deficiency.
- o Acquired access to government field expense allotments, a legislative set-aside, in order to monitor projects through construction period, i.e. site visits.
- o Established procedures to ensure the financial soundness of new loans utilizing such resources as Federal Reserve Bank delinquency listings, financial status reports, and regulatory provisions relating to institutional eligibility and loan cancellation.
- o Completed inventory of all closed projects to ensure prompt and proper billing by the Federal Reserve Bank. Cancelled inactive loans and enforced policy requiring institutions to begin construction, within 18 months of loan reservation.
- o Streamlined procedure to insure prompt delivery of notes and bonds to the Federal Reserve Bank.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

New Loan Commitments: In FY 1982, a total of $40 million was directed to be made available for new loans. This compares with $68 million available in FY 1981.

Table 1 shows the distribution of loan commitments for 1982. These commitments were made from the program's revolving fund, i.e. loan repayments and other income and required no appropriation. Nineteen commitments were made in 1982. Three-quarters of the funds were for construction while 25 percent was used for energy conservation projects. This distribution was similar to 1981.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Table 1
Loan Commitments

	1982	1983
Housing Construction		
Number of loan commitments	14	13
Amount of commitments	$30,043,000	$29,978,000
Average loan commitment	$ 2,145,929	$ 2,306,000
Energy Conservation projects		
Number of loan commitments	5	15
Amount of commitment	$ 9,957,000	$10,022,000
Average loan commitment	$ 1,991,400	$ 668,133
Total number of commitments	19	28
Total amount of commitments	$40,000,000	$40,000,000

Indirect or Off-budget Costs: The Federal Government must absorb the difference between the approximately three percent interest paid by institutions and the prevailing interest rate for Treasury borrowing. Therefore, most of the program's cost is off-budget and does not appear under the College Housing Loans account. Off budget cost for this program in FY 1982 approximated $225 million.

Assessment of Needs: The condition of rapidly expanding enrollments which formerly created a national need for this program no longer exists, and there is no longer the need for a Federal role in this area.

A recent Education Department study of college housing showed which institutions provided housing and to what extent (see Table 2). Nearly all universities (99 percent) provide some housing. Eighty-seven percent of the 4-year colleges provide for some housing but only 36 percent of the 2-year colleges provide housing. More students at private colleges (53 percent of their students) are living in college housing than at public colleges (32 percent of their students).

The occupancy rate is between 95 and 101 percent of the designed capacity. This high demand may show a need for more housing or that institutional housing is a better bargain than non-institutional alternatives. However, only 1 percent of the students are living in substandard housing. Thus, only limited renovation is needed at existing college-owned facilities.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Table 2
Students Housed at Institutions
With Residential Facilities, Fall 1981

Type of Institution	All Institutions	Number of Institutions With Housing	Number of Students Housed (000s)	As a Percent of Full-time Enrollment
Public				
Universities	112	110	626	31
Four-Year Colleges	420	341	546	34
Two-Year Colleges	900	206	82	24
Private				
Universities	74	73	234	42
Four-Year Colleges	1285	1139	722	59
Two-Year Colleges	246	205	77	51

Source: E1

Servicing of Existing Commitments: Amortization of the final issues of participation certificates marketed to the public in 1967-68 must be completed in FY 1987-88. The Department of Education must pay to GNMA approximately $451.5 million by that time. It is necessary that loan repayments be used largely for this purpose, rather than for making new loan commitments.

In 1984, the major portion of loan repayments and other income will be used to pay program operating expenses. These expenses include:

o $72,000,000 for interest expenses on borrowed Treasury funds used to make loans in prior years which was $67,613,000 in 1983

o $28,138,000 for interest expenses on participation certificates was the same as 1983.

o $76,000,000 for principal payments to the GNMA participation sales fund. These funds will be used to amortize the outstanding debt on participation certificates which will be redeemed in 1987-88. This payment was $47,491,000 in 1983.

o $1,445,000 for loan servicing and management expenses of the Federal Reserve and maintenance of properties we have repossessed. This cost was $807,000 in 1983.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

No authority for new loan commitments was requested. This is part of the Administration's overall effort to reduce Federal expenditures and, thereby, control inflation and provide relief to financial markets. In 1984, credit management improvement efforts have been continued and enhanced. It is anticipated that 1984 collections will increase by $12 million over 1982 principal collections and $7 million over 1983.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited

1. Higher Education Panel Survey 55. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. 1982.

2. U.S. Department of Education, Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, FY 1982.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No further studies related to this program are currently planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: James P. Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

ANNUAL INTEREST GRANTS
(CFDA No. 84.001)

Highlights:

- $24,500,000 was requested in the President's budget for FY 1984 to pay interest subsidies on the remaining loans.

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title VII, Part C, Section 734 of the Higher Education Act, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 1132d-3.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	Indefinite	29,000,000
1980	Indefinite	29,000,000
1981	Indefinite	26,000,000
1982	Indefinite	25,500,000
1983	Indefinite	25,000,000

Purpose: To reduce the cost of borrowing from non-Federal sources for the construction, reconstruction, and renovation of needed academic facilities, a program of annual interest subsidy grants to institutions of higher education is supported.

Eligibility: Higher education institutions or higher education building agencies are eligible.

Applicant Requirements: The applicant must finance at least 10 percent of the project through non-Federal sources, must be unable to secure as favorable a loan from other sources, and must undertake the project in an economical manner.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The Federal Government is obligated to pay the annual subsidy over the entire length of the loan with a maximum forty year loan repayment term.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: The facility cannot be used for religious worship or sectarian activity or for a school or department of divinity.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

The current objectives are to meet the Federal commitment on the 625 remaining commerical loans for construction projects approved prior to FY 1974 and to make no new commitments to subsidize additional loans.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Funds appropriated in FY 1983 were equal to the Federal commitment for that period.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: The program appropriations represent the difference between the commerical rate on an loan and an interest rate of 3 percent. Currently, 626 of these grants are in active pay status, 38 projects have been paid in full, and 30 had been terminated.

Program Effectiveness: From the program's inception in FY 1970, 711 grants have been approved, subsidizing a $41.43 billion loan volume. The Federal subsidy has exceeded $1.4 billion over this period.

According to a study of facilities needs, the large volume of academic facilities construction supported by this program assisted in meeting the current and expected national demand for plant facilities. (E.2)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

To meet the Federal commitment to pay interest subsidies on the remaining commercial loans for construction projects approved prior to fiscal year 1974, appropriations as needed will be requested. This will support subsidies against the remaining loan volume of $1.1 billion. No new awards will be made. Appropriations, and appropriation requests in future years will decrease gradually as the loans subject to interest subsidies are retired.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited Above

1. Program files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education

2. The Demand for Facilities in the Postsecondary Sector, 1975 to 1990, Joseph Froomkin, Inc., Washington, D.C. August 15, 1974.

LOANS FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND RENOVATION OF ACADEMIC FACILITIES
(CFDA No. 13.594)

Highlights

- o New funds are expected to pay only for insufficiencies on participation sale certificates and interest deficiencies on earlier Department of Treasury borrowings. (II.D)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Title VII, Part C, of the Higher Education Act, of 1965 as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1132d; and Participation Sales Act of 1966.

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation[1]
1979	$200,000,000	$ 2,204,000
1980	200,000,000	2,189,000
1981	80,000,000	1,656,000
1982	80,000,000	11,096,000[2]
1983	80,000,000	20,143,000

Purpose: To assist higher education institutions in obtaining adequate academic facilities, the Secretary is authorized to make or insure loans for the construction, reconstruction, or renovation of academic facilities.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and higher education building agencies (i.e., State agencies empowered by the State to issue tax-exempt bonds on behalf of private institutions of higher education) are eligible for loans.

Applicant Requirements: Loans are awarded pursuant to the following stipulations: (1) that not less than 20 percent of the development cost of the facility be financed from non-Federal sources (this requirement may be waived for schools qualified as developing institutions under HEA Title III), (2) that the applicant has been unable to secure the amount of such loan from other sources upon terms and conditions equally as favorable as the terms and conditions applicable to loans under this program, (3) that construction will be undertaken in an economical manner, (4) that, in the case of a project to construct an infirmary or other facility designed to provide primarily for outpatient care of students and institutional personnel, no financial assistance be provided for such projects under Title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, (5) that the loan be repaid within fifty years, and (6) that the applicant pay an interest rate of three or four percent.

F. Other Supporting Data

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies are planned or in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3235

Program Studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

Use of Appropriation: The program requires an annual appropriation to cover the operating deficits. These deficits occur because the Secretary is required to make interest payments on participation certificates and on Treasury borrowing that exceed repayments from low interest loans to institutions.

Types of Benefits Provided: Loans for Construction, Reconstruction, and Renovation of Academic Facilities is one of four programs designed to help institutions of higher education meet a national need for academic facilities. The benefits provided to institutions of higher education by this program is the reduction of their financial burden by making available loans for academic facilities with low rates of interest.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: The law allows for a repayment period of 50 years but loans are normally made for 30 years.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Make repayments on a timely basis.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

To collect on defaulted loans and to improve debt collection efforts, a credit management improvement plan, including dollar targets and initiatives for the collection of defaulted loans and delinquent loan payments, was developed and implemented during 1982.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

A collection program was undertaken and, without affecting the ability of the institutions concerned to continue services in postsecondary education, $27.2 million was collected. A total of $1.2 million was collected from institutions in default during 1982, more than the dollar collection goal for such institutions.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In the last 18 years, approximately $640 million has supported loans to over 660 institutions. Since 1975, four new loans, initiated by the Congress, have been made under this program. In 1978, Congress authorized two loans totaling $7.2 million to assist Georgetown University and Tufts University in the construction of two model intercultural centers. In 1981, Congress authorized two additional loans totaling $25 million to assist Boston College in the construction of a new library, and to provide supplementary funds to Georgetown University for the model intercultural center project initiated in 1978.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

Costs: Since this program began in 1965, Congress has appropriated more than $580 million to support loans to institutions with an additional $200 million provided through the sale of participation certificates to the public in 1967 and 1968.

Needs Related to Removal of Physical Barriers: There have not been any comprehensive studies conducted with regard to the overall reconstruction and renovation needs in higher education facilities. However, a special survey was conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1979 to assess the costs at colleges and universities of removing architectural barriers to the handicapped in compliance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. The surveys indicated that institutions were moving ahead to comply with Section 504 without Federal assistance. It was also determined that the capital costs required for removal of architectural barriers at most institutions were small relative to total college budgets. Over a three-year period ending in June 1980 (deadline for compliance with Section 504), the estimated cost of removing architectural barriers represented about three percent of total capital outlays, and only one third of one percent of the total revenues of all the college and universities during this period. (E.2.)

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

No new construction loans are planned. Prior to 1982, the unobligated balance of the loan account was sufficient to cover deficits in the program's annual operating expenses. In 1982, however, the unobligated balance of the fund was depleted due to new loan activity. Appropriations are now required annually to fund operating deficits.

E. Supporting Studies and Analysis Cited in Sections C and F:

1. The Demand for Facilities in the Postsecondary Sector, 1975 to 1990, Joseph Froomkin, Inc., Washington, D.C. August 15, 1974
2. The Impact of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 on American Colleges and Universities, Final Report, NCES, May 1979.
3. Program Files, Office of Postsecondary Education, U.S. Department of Education.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No additional studies are planned for this program.

Contacts for Further Information

Program Operations: Charles Griffith, (202) 245-3253

Program studies: James Maxwell, (202) 245-7884

Notes:

1. Excludes a permanent indefinite appropriation under "Payment of Participation Sales Insufficiencies" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1967.

2. Includes supplemental appropriation of $9,746,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT

TERRITORIAL TEACHER TRAINING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM -- PROJECT GRANTS TO TERRITORIAL JURISDICTIONS (CFDA No. 84.124)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 95-561; Title XV, Part C, Section 1525 of the Education Amendments of 1978. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$2,000,000	---
1980	$2,000,000	$2,000,000
1981	$2,000,000	$1,800,000
1982	$2,000,000	$ 960,000
1983	$2,000,000	$ 960,000
1984	$2,000,000	$1,000,000

Purpose: To provide assistance for the training of teachers in schools in Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

Eligibility: The State education agency (SEA) of each territory is eligible to apply for a grant.

Restrictions: Activities must be directed at teachers who work with students in grades K-12 in public and non-profit private schools. All activities must be directly related to teaching and must be carried out within the territory. Allowable activities include, but are not limited to, inservice teacher training in basic skills development or specific subject areas, curriculum development, use of instructional materials or equipment, classroom management, or training for teachers to achieve full certification under the appropriate territorial requirements.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are for one year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Performance and financial status reports must be provided.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

The purpose of this program has been to make a significant investment in upgrading the skills and capacity of teachers in the territories.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Over the four-year life of the program, total grants will amount to $5.7 million. Based on available estimates of public school teachers in the five territories (see F.1 below), this represents an average investment of over $1,000 per teacher.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Teachers Trained: About 1,800 teachers received training in 1982-83, at an average cost of $533 per teacher.

Costs: The five grants ranged in size from $88,000 to $400,000.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available on improvements in teacher skills or capacities resulting from training activities supported by this program.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Congress has appropriated $1,000,000 for this progam for FY 1984.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses:

There have been no studies of the program.

F. Other Supporting Data:

1. 1980 Statistical Abstract of the United States, Outlying Areas, Tables 1550 and 1556, pages 886-888.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Haroldie Spriggs, (202) 254-6572

Program studies: Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

B. Progress and Accomplishments

Over the four-year life of the program, total grants will amount to $5.7 million. Based on available estimates of public school teachers in the five territories (see F.1 below), this represents an average investment of over $1,000 per teacher.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness

Teachers Trained: About 1,800 teachers received training in 1982-83, at an average cost of $533 per teacher.

Costs: The five grants ranged in size from $88,000 to $400,000.

Program Effectiveness: No information is available on improvements in teacher skills or capacities resulting from training activities supported by this program.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

Congress has appropriated $1,000,000 for this progam for FY 1984.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses:

There have been no studies of the program.

F. Other Supporting Data:

1. 1980 Statistical Abstract of the United States, Outlying Areas, Tables 1550 and 1556, pages 886-888.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies of this program are in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Haroldie Spriggs, (202) 254-6572

Program studies: Judith Anderson, (202) 245-9401

PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES--GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES
(CFDA No. 84.034)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services Act, P.L. 84-597, as amended by the Library Services and Construction Act, Title I, P.L. 91-600, P.L. 93-380, P.L. 95-123, and P.L. 97-35, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. (The LSCA expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$140,000,000	$62,500,000
1980	$150,000,000	$62,500,000
1981	$150,000,000	$62,500,000
1982	$ 65,000,000	$60,000,000
1983	$ 65,000,000	$60,000,000

Purpose: To develop and improve public library service in geographical areas and to groups of persons with inadequate service; to provide library services for patients and inmates of state-supported institutions, physically handicapped individuals, disadvantaged persons in low-income areas, both urban and rural, and those persons who have limited English-speaking ability; to strengthen metropolitan public libraries which function as regional or national resource centers; and to strengthen the capacity of the State Library Agencies.

Eligibility: All State Library Agencies in the 50 States, D.C., Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam.

Applicant Requirements: In order to participate in any Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) Program, each State must have a Basic State Plan approved by the Secretary of Education, or his designated official (in this case it is the Assistant Secretary, OERI), plus a long-range plan (3-5 years) on state priorities for meeting the information needs of the people in the state. An Annual Program plan must also be submitted. To be eligible, the States must match the Federal contribution in proportion to their per capita income as required by program regulations published in the Federal Register and also maintain the same level of non-Federal expenditures as in the second preceding fiscal year.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded after the approval of the Basic State Plan and acceptance of the long-range plan update and an Annual Program plan of activities. These awards are based on a combination of a minimum basic allotment and a formula based on total resident population.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and annual reports are due once a year, 90 days after the conclusion of the fiscal year. Evaluations of projects are to be included.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

- Encourage the extension of public library services through state library subgrants to local public libraries for underserved or unserved counties and small towns across the nation.
- Support the increased capability of the State Library Agencies and the local public libraries to provide basic public library services.
- Encourage the State Library Agencies to select local public library projects which target on innovative library services to the disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, State institutions, and the physically handicapped.
- Complete processing of all State grant award requests.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- The overall goal of having public libraries in all geographic locations throughout the country has been to a great extent achieved -- with over 96 percent of the Nation having access to library services.
- 95 percent of the overall support for basic public library services is derived from local (82%) and state (13%) sources.
- Over 25 percent of the LSCA program funds were used to provide library services to the disadvantaged, limited English-speaking, State institutionalized and physically handicapped.
- Made 54 grant awards throughout the year after approving 54 Basic State Plan agreements for FY 83 and 84, and reviewing and accepting 54 Annual Programs of proposed activities on FY 83 updates of the long-range plan, and completed Annual Reports.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope

Funds and Special Populations Being Provided Library Services
(In Thousands)

Latest Available Data, FY 81	LSCA Funds	Number Served
1. Disadvantaged	$ 6,614	2,975
2. Physically Handicapped	$ 3,579	763
3. State Institutionalized	$ 2,739	833
4. Limited English-speaking	$ 2,505	1,990
5. Aged	$ 557	758
TOTALS	$15,994	7,319

During the past 26 years, nearly $1 billion (FY 57 through FY 83, $965,173,500) of LSCA Title I funds have been used to provide increased access to public libraries and basic information services in areas where they were nonexistent or were inadequate. These funds were also used to develop and improve public library services to the special population groups cited above. The breakout of these expenditures by major program emphasis is noted below:

Areas of Program Emphasis

Latest available data, FY 81	Percentage of LSCA Funds
1. Areas without services or with inadequate services; strengthening metropolitan and major urban libaries as resource centers; strengthening state administration.	74.4%
2. Disadvantaged; physically handicapped; state institutionalized; limited English-speaking; and aged	25.6%

Types of Benefits Provided: Project activities are directed toward improving access to library services not found in the traditional school system. Specific activities in support of these objectives might include a statewide radio reading service for the blind; English-as-a-second language classes; developing coping skills packets (how to get a job, how to use public transportation, how to order in a restaurant, etc.) for the mentally retarded; deposit book collections at senior citizen centers; or a books-by-mail program for rural residents; and literacy programs for functionally illiterate adults.

Program Effectiveness: A comprehensive evaluation of LSCA Title I completed in 1981 by Applied Management Science, Inc. (See E.2) produced findings with respect to four types of program impact as follows:

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness (Continued)

1. Effects on the Public Library Institutional Structure

- LSCA I funds contributed significantly to the establishment of regional systems of public libraries. This has led to the increased provision of library services through books-by-mail and bookmobiles and has improved the capability of local libraries to respond to information requests through centralized purchasing and processing of library materials, interlibrary loan and delivery systems, and through linkages with computerized bibliographic centers.

- LSCA I served to help establish the State library's role in coordinating, serving, and planning statewide public library service programs.

2. Effects on Public Library Services

- In 90 percent of the States, LSCA I caused the introduction of new public library services involving new technology, community outreach, the introduction of audiovisual materials, and providing continuing education for practicing librarians.

- Ninety-four percent of the nation's libraries were able to cite at least one change in service or the introduction of a new service as a result of LSCA I. The benefits most often cited were the promotion of resource sharing through regional and multi-type library systems, more adequate staff and book/nonprint materials, and blind and physically handicapped programs.

- The Evaluation Study concluded that measuring the impact on the adequacy of public library services was "fraught with severe limitations." The States reported that 65 percent of LSCA I funds were used by State, regional and local public library levels "to support and/or improve library services." The impact of LSCA could only be inferred. Also, among public libraries receiving an LSCA I grant, 25.3 percent indicated that such funds generated increased local funding. The study concluded that it would be "both misleading and incorrect to attempt to attribute any direct causal effect of LSCA Title I on the adequacy of public libraries."

3. Effects on Extending and Improving Coverage of Public Library Service in the U.S.

- Between 1965 and 1978 12.4 percent of all localities without public libraries in the U.S. established some type of public library service (e.g., bookmobile or books-by-mail) as a direct result of LSCA I.

4. Effects on the Access to Public Libraries by Specific Groups

- LSCA I has had a significant impact on the establishment and extension of library services to residents of state supported institutions (prisons, mental homes, etc.).

- LSCA I has had a significant impact on the development and the provision of a variety of library services to the blind. These library services were found to dovetail appropriately with the Library of Congress' support of the regional libraries operated under the National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped. On the other hand, there was little evidence that LSCA I funds were meeting the needs of other handicapping conditions.

- There was very little evidence that the LSCA I funds had any measurable impact on increasing the access for those persons identified as being urban or rural disadvantaged -- a priority under LSCA I. (In fairness to the analysis for limited English-speaking persons, this priority was added to LSCA in FY 74. The LSCA I Evaluation Study looked at FY 78 reports, so the long-term trends could not be established.)

In 1982 an historical overview of LSCA was funded by ED which involved the recollections of 13 individuals associated with the activities surrounding the program from its inception in 1956 to the present. Some analyses of program activities also occurs in the 230 page document.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommended Legislation

Proposed Simplification Through Deregulation

During FY 1983 a *Notice for Proposed Rulemaking* was published for LSCA as part of the government-wide effort at simplifying the regulations. The rules were rewritten in simpler language and requirements not in the law were eliminated. The final rule will follow.

Reauthorization

Although a phase-out of the program was proposed, the program has been reauthorized with an appropriation of $65,000,000 for FY 84.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. LSCA Grantee Reports

2. *An Evaluation of Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act*, Applied Management Sciences, 1981.

F. Other Supporting Data

1. *The Library Services and Construction Act: An Historical Overview from the Viewpoint of Major Participants*, by Edward G. Holley and Robert F. Schremser. University of North Carolina, 1982. (Scheduled to be published in 1983 by JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut.)

2. *The Public LIbrary and Federal Policy*, by System Development Corporation, July 1973, published by Greenwood Press, 1974.

3. *Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups*, by System Development Corporation, July 1973.

F. Other Supporting Data (Continued)

4. Basic Issues in the Government Financing of Public Library Services, Government Studies and Systems, May 1973.

5. Study of Exemplary Public Library Reading and Reading Related Programs for Children, Youth and Adults, by Barss, Reitzel and Associates, Inc., 1972.

6. A Study of Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged in Selected Cities, Behavior Science Corporation, 1970.

7. Overview of LSCA Title I, by System Development Corporation, published by Bowker, 1968.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program studies: Jerry Burns, (202) 245-8844

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION -- GRANTS TO STATE LIBRARY AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.035)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, P.L. 89-511, as amended and extended by P.L. 91-600, P.L. 95-123, and P.L. 97-35. (Expires September 30, 1984)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$20,000,000	$ 5,000,000
1980	$20,000,000	$ 5,000,000
1981	$20,000,000	$12,000,000
1982	$15,000,000	$11,520,000
1983	$15,000,000	$11,520,000

Purpose: To provide grants to the State Library Agency for the planning, establishment, and maintenance of cooperative networks of libraries at the local, regional or inter-state level. Such cooperative networks are intended to provide for the systematic and effective coordination of the resources of school, public, academic and special libraries and information centers in order to improve the library services to the special clientele served by each type of library or center.

Eligibility: All State Library Agencies in the 50 states, D.C., Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

Applicant Requirements: Each State must have a Basic State Plan approved by the Secretary of Education, plus a long-range plan (3-5 years) on state priorities for meeting the information needs of the people in the state. An Annual Program plan must also be submitted.

Award Process: Grants are awarded after the approval of the Basic State Plan and acceptance of the long range plan update and an Annual Program plan of activities. These awards are based on a combination of a minimum basic allotment and a formula based on total resident population.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and program reports are due once a year. Evaluations of projects are to be included.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives with respect to this program were as follows:

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- Encourage the establishment of inter-institutional networks of libraries for the coordination of informational services in schools, public libraries, academic, and special libraries and information centers.
- Support the increased capability of the State Library Agencies and regional and local libraries to establish and maintain interlibrary cooperative activities.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- Fifty-four grant awards were made throughout the year after approval of 54 Basic State Plan agreements for FY 83 and 84, and review and acceptance of: 54 Annual Programs of proposed activities in FY 83, updates of the long-range plan, and completed Annual Reports.
- Although matching funds are not required, States demonstrated a commitment to interlibrary cooperative activities through reported expenditures of nearly $13 million in FY 81 or slightly more than a 1:1 matching of Federal funds.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: During the last 17 years, nearly $80 million has been distributed to State, regional and local libraries to develop institutional networks of libraries involving bibliographic access, interlibrary loan, and other resource-sharing programs. These activities have served as demonstrations of the cost-saving concepts brought about through available technologies. The 1983 appropriation assisted the states in funding about 263 cooperative library projects affecting about 29,700 libraries.

	Percentage of LSCA Funds
1. Projects linking libraries through telecommunication systems to data bases	50%
2. Resource sharing projects not linked to automation	40%
3. Training for these activities	10%

These projects are rarely discrete Federal activities. Significant state expenditures are reported as supplementing the Federal funds, even though matching of such funds is not required. In FY 81 California reported expenditures of $8.3 million, New York $2.1 million, and Minnesota, $1.1 million in conjunction with LSCA III expenditures. The breakdown (see E.1) of these expenditures by broad functional areas is noted below:

Types of Benefits Provided: Project activities at the State and local public library level are directed toward improving access to educational and informational services offered by libraries. Specific activities in support of this

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

objective might include: rapid communications systems for linking libraries (computers, TWX, or telephones); delivery systems (telefacsimile, trucks or mail); location tools (published or computer-based lists of library holdings), computer-based information retrieval and information processing systems; and the costs and fees associated with these activities including the training of personnel.

Program Effectiveness: The following summary is based on findings presented in the evaluation study by Applied Management Sciences, Inc., completed five years ago (See E.2). These findings are still relevant to current operations. However, the data here do not reflect the impact of the more than doubling of the LSCA III annual appropriation since the evaluation study was conducted.

1. Effects on the Institutional Patterns of Organization

- In conjunction with LSCA Title I, Title III program funds have brought about a greater centralization of public library planning and coordination at State and regional levels.
- Program funds have been a major driving force behind the development of multilibrary cooperation and networking primarily at the State levels.
- Approximately 20 percent of LSCA I funds also were used by the States to partially or completely support multilibrary and networking activities.

2. Effects on State Support

- LSCA III is credited as having a major influence on State legislatures in passing and modifying legislation favoring cooperation and networking.

3. Effects on Improving Access to Library Resources

- Access to computer-based information services was greatly enhanced through program funding of regional, state, and multi-state cooperative networks.
- Access to book and periodical library resources was enhanced through LSCA III support of information processing systems linked to bibliographic data banks.
- It was judged that interlibrary loan and reference source referral services were an efficient and proper means of providing access to a wide variety of library resources and services. However, there was some question as to how many individuals actually needed and used these services.
- The program influenced nearly 40 percent of the States to make changes in legislation favorably affecting library cooperation and networking.

4. Impact on Innovation in Library Services[1]

- Experimental research and demonstration activities accounted for slightly less than 15 percent of LSCA III projects.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness (Continued)

o Another major outcome of LSCA III has been the strong support for continuing education programs for librarians in new technologies associated with networking.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

Proposed Simplification through Deregulation: During FY 1983 a Notice for Proposed Rulemaking was published for LSCA as part of the government-wide effort at simplifying the regulations (the rules were rewritten in simpler language and requirements not in the law were eliminated.). The final rule will follow.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

1. LSCA Grant Reports
2. A Study of Library Cooperatives, Networks, and Demonstration Projects, Applied Management Sciences completed in March 1978.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Robert Klassen, (202) 254-9664

Program studies: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8844

Notes

1. In 1982 an historical overview of LSCA was funded by ED which involved the recollections of 13 individuals associated with the activities surrounding the LSCA program from its inception to the present (See F.1). Some analysis of program activities also occurs in this 230-page documentation. The report is cited as: The Library Services and Construction Act: An Historical Overview from the Viewpoint of Major Participants, by Edward G. Holley and Robert I. Schremser. University of North Carolina, 1982. (Scheduled to be published by JAI Press, Greenwich, Connecticut in 1983.)

COLLEGE LIBRARY RESOURCES--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND ELIGIBLE, NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS (CFDA No. 84.005)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 201, 202, and 211 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-A; Public Law 89-329 as amended, by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374 and by Section 516 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35; U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1029 (expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$120,000,000 1/	$9,975,000
1980	120,000,000 1/	4,988,000
1981	10,000,000	2,988,000
1982	5,000,000	1,920,000
1983	5,000,000	1,920,000

Purpose: To assist and encourage institutions of higher education and other eligible institutions in the acquisition of library materials. Funds may also be used for the establishment and maintenance of library networks for resource sharing.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and public or private non-profit library institutions whose primary function is providing library services to institutions of higher education on a formal cooperative basis.

Applicant Requirements: All new applicants must have eligibility established by the Division of Institutional Eligibility in the Office of Postsecondary Education. Applications must assure maintenance of effort or provide acceptable requests for waiver of this requirement.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants are awarded in one fiscal year and are to be expended in the following fiscal year.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Grant funds must be used to purchase eligible library materials or to pursue networking activities. Final Financial Status and Performance Reports are due ninety days after the end of the grant-award period. Project records must be maintained for three years after the submission of the final expenditure report, and grantees are subject to audits once every two years.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

During FY 1983, this program's principal objectives were as follows:

o To complete processing of applications and issue notification of awards to successful applicants by May 20, 1983.

A. Goals and Objectives (Continued)

- To assess the applicants that choose networking activities to determine which types of activities are being pursued under this option.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

- 2,141 grants were awarded in FY 1983, averaging $890.
- Over 80 grantees chose to apply funds to networking activities. They belonged to local, regional and national networks. Many grantees elected to purchase library materials that served as interlibrary loan materials, thereby sharing necessary library resources.

C. Cost, Benefits and Effectiveness

Institutions Served: Of 2,141 institutions funded, 1,103 were 4-year colleges and universities; 986 were 2-year institutions; 24 combination and 28 library institutions.

Program Scope: Approximately 70 percent of all eligible institutions of higher education participate in this program.

Types of Benefits Provided: The majority of program funds are used to supplement the library holdings of the institutions served. The awards also provide for necessary updates of special collections; and allow for the purchase of new materials for specific technical courses in computer science, engineering, etc. The funds have also been used to pay membership fees of "online" networks for resource sharing, training of personnel to perform on-line entry of bibliographic data, and specific equipment essential to the operation of external resource-sharing network.

Program Effectiveness: This discretionary program has encouraged institutions to evaluate their holdings and determine which areas need strengthening. It has permitted the introduction of new materials essential to courses currently offered at the schools.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation

In the proposed budget for Fiscal Year 1984, the Department proposed termination of the College Library Resources Program. The reasons offered for this proposal included the decreasing size of the average grant and the absence of legislation that would allow grants to be awarded on the basis of need. In response to this request, no funds were appropriated for this program for Fiscal Year 1984.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above

1. Program files which contain fiscal reports, personal interviews and professional literature.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Beth Fine, (202) 254-5090

Program studies: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8844

Notes

1. Authorization for HEA, Title A and B.

LIBRARY CAREER TRAINING--DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND LIBRARY ORGANIZATIONS OR AGENCIES (CFDA No. 84.036)

Highlights:

o Contract awarded for historical study of program (III).

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B, Public Law 89-329 as amended by the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374, sections 201, 202, 222; 20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022 and 1032 (expires September 30, 1985).

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$120,000,000[1]	$2,000,000
1980	120,000,000[1]	667,000
1981	10,000,000[2]	667,000
1982	1,200,000[2]	640,000
1983	1,200,000[2]	640,000

Purpose: To assist institutions of higher education and library organizations and agencies in training persons in the principles and practices of librarianship and information science, including new techniques of information transfer and communication technology.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education and public or private library organizations or agencies providing, or planning to provide, library services or programs.

Applicant Requirements: Eligible institutions submit a project design to accomplish one or more of the program objectives cited in Section II. Individuals apply directly to the grantee.

Duration of Assistance: A fellowship or long-term institute must provide at least one academic year, but not more than 12 months, of training. A short-term institute must provide as least one week, but no more than six weeks, of training. A traineeship project may not exceed 12 months. Congress mandated in the appropriation language that all assistance for the current fiscal year be used to support fellowships.

Obligations of Recipients: Financial status and performance reports are required following the conclusion of the contract or grant period.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives

The objective for FY 1983 was to increase opportunities for members of underrepresented groups to obtain training and retraining in librarianship; in particular, training beyond the master's degree level.

B. Progress and Accomplishments

The Department awarded grants to 33 institutions, totaling $640,000, in support of 75 fellowships for library training.

The levels of training and the number of awards were:

- -- 56 Masters
- -- 8 Doctorates
- -- 7 Post-masters
- -- 4 Bachelors

Of the 75 awards, 58 (77%) were to females and 47 (63%) were to minorities.

The post-master's fellowships were focussed on retraining librarians (especially handicapped) to: provide health and rehabilitation information to the disabled; and to increase the number of minorities and women in mid- and upper-level library management.

At the Doctoral level, fellowships were directed to the handicapped and toward the upward mobility of minorities and women already in the profession, but in financial need and in need of advanced credentials to compete for jobs at the higher supervisory, administrative, and leadership levels.

C. Costs, Benefits and Effectiveness

Program Scope: In Fiscal Year 1983, the 33 grants totaling $640,000 provided 75 fellowships for the study of library and information science.

Program Effectiveness: Annual reports from previous years (E.1) indicate few or no problems of recipients getting jobs upon completion of Master's or advancing to more senior positions following post-master's or doctoral studies.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation

For Fiscal Year 1984, termination of funding was proposed by the Department, because there is no longer a critical shortage of librarians.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses

1. Program files which contain narrative and fiscal reports, personal interviews, and professional literature. From 1973 through 1983, 987 (71%) of all awards 1,392 were to target minority groups.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses (Continued)

2. Overview of the Library Fellowships Program, by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., of Washington, DC, 1970.

3. Data Collection and Description of HEA Title II-B Institutes, by Rutgers, New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1972.

4. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics Library Human Resources: A Study of Supply and Demand. King Research, Inc., May, 1983.

F. Other Supporting Data

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b)

Because there is no definitive data on the impact of Title II-B, HEA, Library Career Training, the Department has contracted for a study, Historical Review of Higher Education Act, Title II-B Fellowships Program.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the accomplishments of the past recipients of fellowship awards under HEA II-B, Library Career Training program and to determine the effects of the change in legislation enacted in 1971. Ancillary purposes are to determine if shortages in graduate library school faculties have been reduced, whether or not minorities and women have made it to top management in libraries, and whether or not minorities have entered the profession.

St. John's University, Jamaica, New York, was awarded this contract, which should be completed by May, 1984, for $20,000.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program operation: Frank A. Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program effectiveness: Art Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8844

NOTES:

1. Includes authorization for HEA Title II, Part A (College Library Resources).

2. Authorization for HEA Title II, Part B, Section 222, 223, 224

LIBRARY RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATIONS -- DISCRETIONARY GRANTS AND CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND OTHER ELIGIBLE AGENCIES, INSTITUTIONS, AND ORGANIZATIONS

(CFDA No. 84.039)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: Sections 201, 202, and 223 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Title II-B, Public Law 89-329 as redesignated by Section 111 of the Education Amendments of 1972, Public Law 92-318 and as amended by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980, Public Law 96-374, and by Section 516 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Public Law 97-35; 20 U.S.C. 1021, 1022, and 1033. (Expires September 30, 1985)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$120,000,000 1/	$1,000,000
1980	120,000,000 1/	333,000
1981	10,000,000 2/	250,000
1982	1,200,000 2/	240,000
1983	1,200,000 2/	240,000

Purpose: To make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher eductaion and other public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for research and/or demonstration projects related to the improvement of libraries, training in librarianship, and information technology, and for the dissemination of information derived from such projects.

Eligibility: Institutions of higher education, public and private agencies, institutions, or organizations.

Applicant Requirements: An applicant must demonstrate, in its application, that the project meets the requirements of the Act and all applicable regulations.

Duration and Phasing of Assistance: Grants and contracts are usually awarded for a twelve-month period, with exceptions justified in contracts from time to time and may be for up to five years. Extensions may be granted at no additional cost to the Government.

Obligations of Grant and Contract Recipients: Grant recipients are required to submit an annual performance report. Contract recipients submit monthly voucher requests for payment, quarterly progress reports, and other reports as stipulated in the contract.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983, the Department's principal objectives for this program were as follows:

- To monitor the project, "New Directions in Library and Information Science Education"
- To plan and initiate a contract to determine the historical impact of the fellowship program funded under HEA II-B, Library Career Training
- To plan and initiate two contracts on topics suggested in A Library and Information Science Research Agenda for the 1980's. Topics chosen were, "Role of Libraries in Creating and Providing Viewtext Information Services"; and "Diffusion of Innovations in Library and Information Science."

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Monitoring activities related to the study, "New Directions in Library and Information Science Education" included attendance at two of the Advisory Council meetings and receipt of quarterly performance reports. The study is to determine the competencies needed now and in the next twenty years by the library and information science profession.
- The project, Historical Impact of Higher Education Act II-B, Library Career Training, was awarded May 5 to St. John's University, Jamaica, New York. It will ascertain the accomplishments of past recipients of fellowship awards including examination of the following issues: if shortages in graduate library school facilities have been reduced; whether or not minorities and women have achieved top management positions in libraries; and whether or not minorities have entered the profession.
- The Diffusion of Innovation in Library and Information Science project will identify major innovations in library and information science developed in the last ten years, trace the development and distribution of the innovation, develop a model for planned diffusion, and recommend options needed to develop a diffusion network for library and information science.
- Competition among eligibles under the Small Business Act, Section 8a was held for the study, "The Role of Libraries in Creating and Providing Viewtext Information Services" to show how the Nation's libraries are using the new technologies to transmit print material --e.g., television, cable, telephone, cassettes, discs, etc.

C. Cost, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In FY 1983, program activity included the following:

- As a result of a contract supported in FY 81, Cuadra Associates reported on "A Library and Information Science Research Agenda for the 1980's." This report has already had two types of impact: researchers are using it to direct new research inquiries, and the Department used it to guide some of its FY 83 library research initiatives under HEA II-B.
- As a result of a contract supported in FY 82, a research project is underway by King Research Inc. entitled, "New Directions in Library and Information Science Education." It addresses the training of future librarians and information specialists, through the end of this century.
- Plans are underway for a series of regional seminars at which leaders in librarianship and education will consider how libraries can implement the recommedations of the National Commission on Excellence in Education Report, A Nation at Risk. This initiative will include planning and implementation phases in FY 84.

Program Effectiveness: No data available.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendations for Legislation:

No funds were requested for FY 1984.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C Above:

None

F. Other Supporting Data:

None

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417 (b)

No further studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information:

Program Operations: Frank Stevens, (202) 254-5090

Program Effectiveness: Arthur S. Kirschenbaum, (202) 245-8844

Notes:

1. Authorization for HEA Titles II-A and II-B
2. Authorization for HEA Title II-B, Sections 222, 223, and 224

STRENGTHENING RESEARCH LIBRARY RESOURCES-
DISCRETIONARY GRANTS TO MAJOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES
(CFDA No. 84.091)

I. PROGRAM PROFILE

Legislation: P.L. 89-329 Title II, Part C, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended by Section 201 of the Education Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-374), and P.L. 97-35, 20 U.S.C. 1021. (Expires September 30, 1985.)

Funding Since 1979:

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1979	$ 20,000,000	$ 6,000,000
1980	20,000,000	6,000,000
1981	10,000,000	6,000,000
1982	6,000,000	5,760,000
1983	6,000,000	6,000,000

Purpose: To promote research and education of high quality throughout the United States by providing financial assistance to (1) help major research libraries maintain and strengthen their collections; and (2) assist them in making their holdings available to other libraries and to individual researchers and scholars outside their primary clientele.

Eligibility: Only major research libraries are eligible. Major research libraries may be public or private nonprofit institutions, including the resources of an institution of higher education, independent research libraries, and State or public libraries. They must demonstrate that they have collections which make a significant contribution to higher education and research, are broadly based, are recognized as having national or international significance for scholarly research, are of a unique nature, and contain material not widely available which is in substantial demand by researchers and scholars not connected with the applicant institution.

Criteria for Awards: Awards are based on the strength of the library's qualifications as a major research facility, and the quality of the proposed project, including such factors as evidence of need, cost-effectiveness, and institutional commitment.

Use of Awards: Grantees may acquire books, materials, staff; maintain, index, abstract, and distribute materials; or pursue other activities as proposed in their grant applications.

Obligations of Grant Recipients: Financial and performance reports are due thirty days after the close of the grant period. Financial records are expected to be maintained for three years after date of the submission of the annual expenditure report. Grantees must inform State agencies of their activities under this title.

II. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(a)

A. Goals and Objectives:

During FY 1983 the Department's continuing objectives for this program were to:

- Increase access to research materials.
- Preserve unique materials.
- Assist research libraries in acquiring distinctive, unique and specialized materials.
- Initiate specialized research and development projects.
- Promote cooperative activity among institutions.
- Extend benefits to as many institutions as possible including previously unfunded institutions.

B. Progress and Accomplishments:

- Thirty-three of the thirty-five fiscal year 1983 grantees chose bibliographic control as the principal area of project activity by adding new entries to national data bases, thus making additional research materials accessible.
- Thirteen grantees used Title II-C funds for advanced preservation techniques to make rare and unique materials more available.
- Seven grantees acquired specialized materials and entered the bibliographic records into national data bases, making additional unique materials accessible and available to researchers and scholars.
- Specialized research was initiated and supported in such diverse areas as Melanesian studies, the impact of technology on society, and industrial relations.
- Four cooperative projects, involving eighteen institutions, were funded.
- Eight new grantees were among the thirty-five primary grantees funded in fiscal year 1983; counting institutions benefiting under cooperative projects, 49 research libraries were supported.

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness:

Program Scope: In fiscal year 1983, 92 applicants requested $16,900,000. The FY 1983 appropriation of $6,000,000 supported 35 grants involving 49 separate major research libraries. The grants ranged in size from $35,750 to $425,000, with an average of $171,000. All geographic areas of the country are represented. Types of institutions receiving grants are as follows:

C. Costs, Benefits, and Effectiveness: (continued)

Libraries at institutions of Higher Education	27
Independent Research Libraries	4
Public Libraries	1
State Libraries	1
Museums	2
Total:	35

Major Activities and Associated Benefits:

- o Implementation of national bibliographic network. Through systematic sharing of bibliographic data, access to rare materials is facilitated and thousands of hours are saved by eliminating duplicative efforts in cataloguing and indexing. In FY 1983, 79 percent of the total funds awarded were used for bibliographic control ($4,738,545).

- o Physical preservation of rare materials. Poor physical condition limits access and use, and progressive deterioration may eventually result in the total loss of rare materials. In FY 1983, thirteen of the thirty-five grantees used part or all of their Title II-C funds to preserve fragile and deteriorating research materials. Thirteen percent of the funds awarded were spent for this activity ($909,612).

- o Development of specialized collections . Centralized collections of rare or specialized materials facilitate research. In FY 1983, $351,813 went to support collections of the personal papers of eight modern writers, Chinese, Japanese, and Persian language materials, and Western European law documents.

D. Plans for Program Improvement and Recommendation for Legislation:

The Department's fiscal year 1984 Budget requested no funds for this program.

E. Supporting Studies and Analyses Cited in Section C:

None.

F. Other Supporting Data:

None.

III. RESPONSE TO GEPA 417(b):

No studies related to this program are currently in progress.

Contacts for Further Information

Program operations: Frank Stevens (202) 254-5090

Program studies: Arthur S. Kirschenbaum (202) 245-8844

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

INDEX TO THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

NOTE: All three-digit numbers are chapter references. These numbers appear in the upper-right hand corner of each page of the report. Where only a portion of the chapter relates to the index heading, the number of the page within the chapter is given. For example "116-4" refers to the fourth page of Chapter 116.

Academic Facilities, 524, 525
Adult Education:
  Indian Education, 113
  State Administered Program, 406
Aid to Land-Grant Colleges, 522
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Program, 114
American Indians, see Indian Education
Arts in Education Program, 117

Basic Educational Opportunity (Pell) Grants, 501
Bilingual Education:
  Basic Projects, 201
  Demonstration Projects, 201
  Fellowship Program, 204
  Material Development Projects, 205
  Support Services Projects, 205
  Training Projects, 204
  Transition Program for Refugee Children, 203
  Vocational Training, 202
  Vocational Instructor Training, 202
  Vocational Instructional Materials, 202
Block Grant (Elementary and Secondary Education), 104
Business and International Education Program (Language Training Area Studies), 520

Captioned Film Loan Program, (Media Services), 312
Centers for Independent Living, 323
Challenge Grant Program, 514
Civil Rights Training and Advisory Services, 106
Close-Up Foundation (Ellender Fellowships), 110
College Housing Loans, 523
College Library Resources, 604
College Work-Study, 506
College Work-Study and Cooperative Education, 506, 521
Construction, Schools (in federally affected areas), 109
Cooperative Education Programs, 521

Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 321
Delinquent Children, 103
Desegregation Assistance, 104-5, 106
  On the Basis of Sex, 106, 115
  On the Basis of National Origin, 106
  On the Basis of Race, 106
Direct Student Loan Program, National, 505

Disadvantaged Students:
  Children in State-Administered Institutions, 103
  Education for, 101, 107, 110
  Legal Training for, 517
  Postsecondary Education, 507, 508, 509, 510
  Special Services for, 510
  Vocational Education Programs for, 402
Dissemination of Exemplary Educational Practices, 119
Doctoral Dissertation Research Program, (Fulbright-Hays), 519

Early Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, 101, 102, 104, 107, 114, 117, 118, 119
Education for the Disadvantaged, 101, 103, 107, 110, 402, 507, 508, 509, 510, 517
Educational Opportunity Centers, 509
Educational Television and Technology, 119-4,5
Elementary and Secondary Education Block Grant, 104
Ellender Fellowships, 110
Entitlement Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Indian Tribal Schools, 111

Faculty Research Abroad (Fulbright-Hays), 519
Fellowships: for Graduate and Professional Study, 518, 519
  for Bilingual Teachers, 204
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Foreign Language Area Studies, 520
Film, Captioned, (Media Services), 312
Follow Through, 107
Foreign Language and Area Studies, 519, 520
Fulbright-Hays Programs, 519
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 512

General Assistance for the Virgin Islands, 105
Graduate and Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519, 520
Guaranteed Student Loan Program, 504

Handicapped Children, Early or Preschool Education for, 302, 303, 306
Handicapped:
  and Deaf-Blind, Programs for, 305, 308, 321
  Arts in Education, 117
  Higher Education for, 510
  Media and Films for, 312
  Migrants, 320
  Personnel Training and Recruitment for Education of, 309, 310
  Recreation, 319
  Regional Resource Centers, 304
  Research, Demonstration, 306, 311, 313, 314, 317, 324
  Services to, 101-3. 301, 302, 303, 305, 307, 314, 315, 320, 323
  Special Studies, 313
  State Aid Grant Program, 302
  State-Supported School Programs, State Grant Program, 301
  Vocational Rehabilitation for, 315, 316, 318, 322
High School Equivalency Program, Migrant Education, 116

Higher Education
  Cooperative Education, 521
  Delivery System, 500
  Developing Institutions, 512-6, 514, 515
  Direct Grants, 501,502
  Direct Loans, 505
  for the Deaf, 308
  for the Disadvantaged, 501, 502, 507, 508, 509, 510, 517, 605-2
  for the Handicapped, 510, 605-2
  for Indian Students, 112
  for Migrant Students, 116
  for Veterans, 511
  for Vocational Students, 401-6
  Guaranteed Student Loans, 504
  Housing, College Loans, 523
  Improvement, 512
  Institutional Aid, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 525, 604
  Law, 516, 517
  Overview, 500
  Postgraduate, 518, 519, 520
  Special Staff Training, 513
  State Student Incentive Grants, 503
  Supplemental Grants, 502
  Talent Search, 508
  Work-Study, 506

Impact Aid, see School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
Incentive Grants to States for Student Assistance, 503
Independent Living, Centers for, 323
Indian Education:
  Adult Indian Education, 113
  Demonstration Projects, 112
  Entitlement Grants to Local Educational Agencies and Indian-Controlled Schools, 111
  Fellowships for Indian Students, 112
  Personnel Development Projects, 112
  Resource, Evaluation Centers, 112
  Vocational Education Program for Indian Tribes and Organizations, 404
Indian Students, Services or Aid to, 101-3, 102-6, 111, 112, 113, 116-4, 403-4, 404, 406-4, 507-5, 508-4, 509-4, 510-7, 517-5, 518-6, 520-11,12
Inexpensive Book Distribution, 118
Institutions of Higher Education, Payments to, 512, 514, 515, 522, 523, 524, 525, 604
Interest Subsidy Grants for Academic Facilities Loans, 524
Interlibrary Cooperation, State Grant Program, 603
International Education and Business Program (Language Training and Area Studies), 520

Land-Grant Colleges, Aid to, 522
Language and Areas Studies, 519, 520
Language-Minority or Limited English-Proficient, Services or Aid to, 101-3, 102-6, 116-4, 201, 202, 203, 204, 403-4, 406-3, 507-5, 508-4, 509-4, 510-7, 517-5, 518-6, 520-11,12, 521-4, 602-3
Law-Related Education, 119
Law School Clinical Experience Program, 516
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged, 517

Libraries:
  Career Training, 605
  College Library Resources, 604
  Public Library Services, State Grant Programs, 602, 603
  Research and Demonstration, 606
  Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607

Media Services and Captioned Film Loan Program, 312
Migrant Education
  College Assistance Program, 116
  Handicapped, 320
  High School Equivalency Program, 116
  State Formula Grant Program, 102
Mina Shaughnessy Scholars Program, 512
Minority Students, Services or Aid to, 101-3, 102-6, 201, 202, 203, 204, 403-4, 501-8, 502-9, 503-7, 504-10, 505-9, 506-10, 507-5, 508-4, 509-4, 510-7, 517-5, 518-6, 520-11,12, 521-4, 602-3, 605-2

National Diffusion Network, 119

Pell Grants Program (formerly BEOGs), 501
Personnel Training, Recruitment for Education of the Handicapped, 309, 310
Postsecondary Education (See Higher Education)
Preschool Education for Handicapped Children, 306
Professional Study, Fellowships for, 518, 519
Public Library Services-State Grant Programs, 602, 603

Reading is Fundamental, 118
Recruitment and Information (Special Education), 309, 310
Refugee children, 203
Rehabilitation, See Vocational Rehabilitation
Research and Development:
  Handicapped, 306, 308, 311, 313, 314, 321
  Libraries, 606, 607
  Secretary's Discretionary Fund, 119
  Vocational Education, 405

Secretary's Discretionary Fund, 114, 117, 118, 119
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-School Construction, 109
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas-Maintenance and Operations, 108
Shaughnessy, Mina, Scholars Program (FIPSE), 512
Special Education, Recruitment and Information, 309, 310
Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, 510
Strengthening Research Library Resources, 607
Student Assistance, Postsecondary (See Higher Education)

Talent Search, 508
Teacher Training:
  Bilingual Education, 202, 204
  Special Education, 309
  Teachers of Secondary Disadvantaged Students, 110
  Territorial Teachers, 601
  Vocational (Bilingual), 202

Technology and Educational Television, 119-4, 5
Territorial Teacher Training, 601
Training and Recruitment, Handicapped Education, 309, 310
Training, Librarians, 605
Training, Bilingual Education Projects, 204
Training, Rehabilitation Personnel, 316
Training, Special Program Staff, 513

Upward Bound, 507

Veterans' Cost-of-Instruction, 511
Virgin Islands, General Assistance for, 105
Vocational Education:
  Basic Grants to States, 401
  Bilingual, see Bilingual Vocational Programs
  for Consumer and Homemaking Education, 403
  Programs for the Disadvantaged, 402
  Program for Indian Tribes and Indian Organizations, 404
  Research and Special Projects, 405
Vocational Rehabilitation:
  Basic Grants to States, 314
  Centers for Independent Living, 323
  Migratory Farmworkers, 320
  Projects With Industry, 322
  Severely Handicapped, 318

Women's Educational Equity, 106, 115
Work-Study, College 506, 521

APPENDIX

EVALUATION CONTRACTS ACTIVE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1983

SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF MARCH 22, 1984

SEQ. NO.	CONTRACT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT	CONTRACTOR NAME, LOCATION, AND TYPE, START AND END DATES	PROJECT MONITOR & ORGANIZATION	OBLIG DOLLARS
1. STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS DIVISION					
1 77 502	100-76-0127,100-79-0101 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 77: 25000 78: 25000 79: 25000 80: 15000 81: 15000 82: 15000 83: 15000	PREPARATION OF COMPUTER-PREPARED TABLES FOR ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL REPORT ON STATE USES OF FEDERAL EDUCATION FUNDS (GEPA 406A)	PINKERTON COMPUTER CONSULTANTS BAILEY'S CROSSROADS, VA. (P) 2/77 TO 9/84	ANDERSON J I OPBE	135000
1 80 114	300-80-0933 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 80: 487660 82: 1712145	A DESCRIPTION OF ESEA TITLE I DISTRICT PROGRAMS SINCE 1978 (TITLE I FUNDS)	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY INC MCLEAN, VA. (P) 9/80 TO 9/83	TUCKER OPBE	2199805
1 80 505	300-80-0862 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 80: 326678 81: 1116740	EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF PART A PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS FUNDED UNDER TITLE IV OF THE INDIAN EDUCATION ACT (INDIAN ED FUNDS)	DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES ARLINGTON, VA. (P) 9/80 TO 6/83	SHULER OPBE	1443418
1 81 201	300-81-0420 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 81: 477541 82: 493058	ESAA MAGNET SCHOOLS STUDY (ESAA FUNDS)	JAMES H LOWRY & ASSOCIATES CHICAGO, ILL. (P) 10/81 TO 10/83	MESSIER OPBE	970599
1 81 501	300-81-0433 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 81: 396097	SYNTHESIS OF EVALUATION AND RESEARCH EVIDENCE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION (BILINGUAL FUNDS)	SWRL ED RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT LOS ALAMITOS, CALIFORNIA (N) 10/81 TO 6/83	SHOEMAKER OPBE	396097
1 82 101	300-82-0374 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1398465 83: 1399654	OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--I	RMC RESEARCH CORP. PORTSMOUTH, N. H. (P) 10/82 TO 9/84	STONEHILL OPBE	2798119
1 82 102	300-82-0375 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82: 1246381 83: 1399224	OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CENTER--II	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY, INC. INDIANAPOLIS, IND. (P) 10/82 TO 9/84	STONEHILL OPBE	2645605

```
                         SUMMARY OF PLANNING AND EVALUATION CONTRACTS AS OF MARCH 22, 1984
SER.
NO.            CONTRACT NUMBER               DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT              CONTRACTOR NAME,            PROJECT MONITOR  OBLIG
                                                                                 LOCATION, AND TYPE,          & ORGANIZATION  DOLLARS
                                                                                 START AND END DATES

1 82 103     300-82-0376               OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I           EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE       STONEHILL       2619617
                                       EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE       ATLANTA, GA.                 (N)  OPBE
                                       CENTER--III                           10/82 TO  9/84
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82:    1219917
                      83:    1399700

1 82 104     300-82-0377               OPERATION OF ECIA CHAPTER I           NORTHWEST REGIONAL LABORATORY     STONEHILL       2696295
                                       EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE       PORTLAND ORE.                (N)  OPBE
                                       CENTER--IV                            10/82 TO  9/84
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82:    1297894
                      83:    1398401

1 82 301     400-82-0020               SCHOOL FINANCE STUDY                  EDUCATION COMM. FOR THE STATES    ENGLISH          150000
                                                                             DENVER, COLO.                (N)  OPBE
                                                                              9/82 TO  9/83
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82:     150000

1 83 101     300-83-0286               A STUDY OF LOCAL OPERATIONS UNDER     STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE       CHELEMER         389000
                                       ECIA CHAPTER 2                        MENLO PARK, CALIF.           (N)  OPBE
                                                                              8/83 TO 12/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:     389000

1 83 102     300-82-0380               EDUCATION ANALYSIS CENTER             ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY INC           EDELSTEIN        242933
                                                                             MCLEAN, VA.                  (P)  OPBE
                                                                             10/82 TO  9/85
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:     242933

1 83 201                               NATIONAL LONGITUDINAL EVALUATION OF   DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES            SHULER          1600000
                                       THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SERVICES FOR     ARLINGTON, VA.               (P)  OPBE
                                       LANGUAGE-MINORITY LIMITED-ENGLISH-     0/ 0 TO 12/84
                                       PROFICIENT STUDENTS
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:    1600000

...................SUBTOTAL STATE AND LOCAL GRANTS DIVISION              18286488·

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:          0
                         70:          0
                         71:          0
                         72:          0
                         73:          0
                         74:          0
                         75:          0
                         76:          0
                         77:      25000
                         78:      25000
                         79:      25000
                         80:     829338
                         81:    2005378
                         82:    7532860
                         83:    7843912
```

START AND END DATES

3. STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION

3 75 011	FUNDS TRANSFER FUNDING HISTORY, FY 75: 63442 76: 62900 77: 70000 78: 77190 79: 77250 80: 141262 81: 99757 82: 111162 83: 121392	SUPPORT OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION PANEL (CONTINUING PROJECT)	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION WASHINGTON, D. C. 7/74 TO 9/84	(F)	CORRALLO OPBE	824355
3 78 010	300-78-0356 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 78: 995263 80: 437922 82: 180000	EVALUATION OF THE SPECIAL SERVICES FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS PROGRAM	SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT CORP. SANTA MONICA, CAL. 9/78 TO 11/83	(P)	BERLS OPBE	1613185
3 79 001	300-79-0776 COMPLETED--REPORT AVAILABLE FUNDING HISTORY, FY 79: 288820	THE FINANCIALLY DISTRESSED INSTITUTION	AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION WASHINGTON D.C. 9/79 TO 12/82	(N)	CORRALLO OPBE	288820
3 79 002	300-79-0777 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 79: 483423 80: 64148 82: 90256	EVALUATION OF THE LANGUAGE TRAINING AND AREA STUDIES PROGRAM	THE RAND CORPORATION SANTA MONICA CAL. 10/79 TO 9/83	(N)	BERLS OPBE	637827
3 80 002	300-80-0834 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 80: 127561 81: 325718 82: 335850	ASSESSMENT OF THE STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS PROGRAM	RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE DURHAM, N. C. 9/80 TO 6/83	(N)	CORRALLO OPBE	789129
3 81 002	300-81-0295 FUNDING HISTORY, FY 81: 110000 82: 121684 83: 181146	SUPPORT OF COOPERATIVE INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM DATA ACQUISITION AND ANALYSIS OF ANNUAL FRESHMAN SURVEY	CAL. U OF, AT LOS ANGELES LOS ANGELES CAL. 3/81 TO 3/84	(A)	HART OPBE	412930

SER.
NO.
CONTRACT NUMBER
DESCRIPTION OF CONTRACT
CONTRACTOR NAME,
LOCATION, AND TYPE.
PROJECT MONITOR OBLIG
& ORGANIZATION DOLLARS

```
NO.            CONTRACT NUMBER              DESCRIPTION OF CO    T               LOCATION, AND TYPE,        & ORGANIZATI     DOLLARS
                                                                                  START AND END DATES

3 81 003   300-81-0210               TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR POSTSECONDARY  APPLIED SYSTEMS INSTITUTE           MAXWELL        573303
                                     EDUCATION PLANNING                   WASHINGTON, D. C.            (P)   OPBE
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 81:      95966                                       7/81 TO  9/84
                      82:     197361
                      83:     279976

3 83 101   300-83-0028               RAPID ASSESSMENT OF THE ED INSTITU-  JUNG, STEVEN                        DEPLS           10000
                                     TIONAL ELIGIBILITY AND COMPLIANCE    PALO ALTO, CAL.              ( )   OPBE
                                     MONITORING SYSTEMS                    2/83 TO  6/83
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:      10000

3 83 102   300-83-0023               ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF      FROOMKIN, JOSEPH, INC.              MORRISSEY        8453
                                     COLLEGE COSTS, PARENTAL CONTRIBUTION WASHINGTON, D.C.             (P)   OPBE
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:       8453 AND STUDENT ASSISTANCE                3/83 TO  2/84

......................SUBTOTAL STUDENT AND INSTITUTIONAL AID DIVISION       5157902

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:       0
                         70:       0
                         71:       0
                         72:       0
                         73:       0
                         74:       0
                         75:   63442
                         76:   62900
                         77:   70000
                         78: 1072453
                         79:  849493
                         80:  770893
                         81:  631441
                         82: 1036313
                         83:  600967
```

```
NO. [illegible]      CONTRACT NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF C[illegible]CT            LOCATION, AND TYPE,        & ORGANIZAT[illegible] DOLLARS
                                                                                START AND END DATES

5. QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIV.

5 83 101    300-82-0248             EDUCATION ANALYSIS CENTER            PELEVIN ASSOCIATES                  EDELSTEIN      506626
                                                                         WASHINGTON, D.C.             ( )   OPBE
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:     506626                                     10/82 TO  9/85

5 83 102    300-83-0166             ANALYSIS OF THE PROVISION OF TECHNI- COSMOS CORPORATION                  WEINHEIMER       9990
                                    CAL ASSISTANCE AS A FEDERAL ROLE IN  WASHINGTON, D.C.             ( )   OPBE
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:       9990 EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT               6/83 TO  9/83

....................SUBTOTAL QUALITY AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATION DIV.        516616

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:         0
                       70:         0
                       71:         0
                       72:         0
                       73:         0
                       74:         0
                       75:         0
                       76:         0
                       77:         0
                       78:         0
                       79:         0
                       80:         0
                       81:         0
                       82:         0
                       83:    516616
```

```
NO          CONTRAC  NUMBER          DESCRIPTION OF        CT          LOCATION, AND TYPE,        $ ORGANIZA          DOLLARS
                                                                        START AND END DATES

7. PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIV.

7 83 101    300-83-0211           DATA PROCESSING & TECHNICAL SUPPORT
                                  FOR PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS                          BIRMAN         485000
                                  DIVISION                                              ( )    OPPE
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 83:    485000                                 7/83 TO  9/84

....................SUBTOTAL PLANNING AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS DIV.          485000

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 57-69:          0
                         70:          0
                         71:          0
                         72:          0
                         73:          0
                         74:          0
                         75:          0
                         76:          0
                         77:          0
                         78:          0
                         79:          0
                         80:          0
                         81:          0
                         82:          0
                         83:     485000
```

```
NO.          CONTRACT NUMBER              DESCRIPTION OF C      CT                LOCATION, AND TYPE,          & ORGANIZAT      DOLLARS
                                                                                  START AND END DATES

9. COORDINATION STAFF

9 77 001     HEW-100-77-0034              COMPUTER TIME IN SUPPORT OF             COMNET COMPUTER NETWORK CORP.          MARONEY          1563508
                                          PLANNING AND EVALUATION PROJECTS        WASHINGTON, D.C.                 (P)   OPBE
                                          (INCLUDES $5000 TITLE I FUNDS IN         5/77 TO  9/83
                                          FY 80)
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 77:      33124
                      78:     247000
                      79:     295000
                      80:     270000
                      81:     220000
                      82:     258304
                      83:     240000

9 82 001     WMZI ACCT AT NIH             TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO NIH FOR USE OF     NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH          MARONEY           535000
                                          NIH COMPUTER FACILITY                   BETHESDA, MD.                    (F)   OPBE
                                                                                  10/81 TO  9/83
  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 82:     225000
                      83:     310000

...................SUBTOTAL COORDINATION STAFF                              2098508

  FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:        0
                         70:        0
                         71:        0
                         72:        0
                         73:        0
                         74:        0
                         75:        0
                         76:        0
                         77:    33124
                         78:   247000
                         79:   295000
                         80:   270000
                         81:   220000
                         82:   483304
                         83:   550000
```

```
••••••••••••••••••GRAND TOTAL     26544514

   FUNDING HISTORY, FY 67-69:            0
                          69:            0
                          70:            0
                          71:            0
                          72:            0
                          73:            0
                          74:            0
                          75:        63442
                          76:        62900
                          77:       128124
                          78:      1344453
                          79:      1169493
                          80:      1870231
                          81:      2856819
                          82:      9052557
                          83:      9996495
```